114 1764, No 12

A

DEFENCE

Of the OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

Charter and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Goſpel in Foreign Parts,

AGAINST

An anonymous Pamphlet falſly intitled,

A CANDID EXAMINATION

Of Dr. MAYHEW's Obſervations, *&c.*

AND ALSO AGAINST

The LETTER to a Friend annexed thereto, ſaid to contain a SHORT VINDICATION of ſaid Society. By one of its Members.

By JONATHAN MAYHEW, D. D.

Paſtor of the WEST Church in *Boſton.*

Cannot my Taſte diſcern PERVERSE *Things?* JOB.

Let the RIGHTEOUS *ſmite me, it ſhall be a Kindneſs; and let* HIM *reprove me, it ſhall be an excellent Oyl, which ſhall not break my Head*——— K. DAVID.

BOSTON printed: *LONDON* reprinted for W. NICOLL, in *St. Paul's Church-Yard.*

M.DCC.LXIV.

BRITISH MUSEUM

A DEFENCE, &c.

The INTRODUCTION.

Concerning the Manner in which the Author of the Obſervations, &c. *has been treated by his Opponents; and the Way in which he propoſes to treat them, in this* DEFENCE.

THE Indian method of attacking their enemies from dark thickets, where they lie concealed, and diſcharge their lead undiſcovered, inſtead of appearing openly to face them on equal ground, is generally conſidered by Europeans as ungenerous, daſtardly and diſhonourable. The manner in which my epiſcopal adverſaries have aſſaulted me, ſince the publication of my *Obſervations*, bears a conſiderable reſemblance to this Indian way of fighting. There has been one pop after another at me, in ſucceſſion, for three or four months; from whom or whence I was as much at a loſs, as the troops near the Monongahela were, when ſo many brave Britons fell a ſacrifice to inviſible ſavages †. But theſe warriors of the church militant, whoſe fire I have ſo long ſuſtained, and who, while they were too modeſt to ſhew their heads, have ſufficiently expoſed the malevolence of their hearts, differ very much from the ſavages in one material point: they are far from being equally good markſmen; they have not taken a right aim. Moſt of them, indeed, have diſcharged little beſides mud and dirt at me; from which no execution could be expected: And accordingly, I find myſelf at laſt,

† Gen. Braddock's defeat.

not wounded, but only beſpattered. Nor am I under the leaſt apprehenſion, that any of their filth will ſtick; much leſs, that it will prove mortal, however nauſeous, and with how much fury ſoever it has been diſcharged at me.

But, to diſmiſs metaphor and ſimile for the preſent; it ſeems hardly fair or honourable, when I prefixed my *name* to what I publiſhed, for ſo many perſons to write againſt me, one after another, without doing the like. Let them make the caſe their own. Unleſs they ſuppoſed, they could give a ſolid, rational anſwer to what I wrote, and at which they appear to have been ſo much alarmed, it did not become them to write at all upon this occaſion. And if they thought they had actually done ſo, our common readers will judge, whether my *Obſervations* were ſo very contemptible, or their modeſty and humility ſo very great, that they would, by concealing their names, have declined even ſo inconſiderable an honor as that of confuting them. They have, in ſhort, tacitly confeſſed, by this conduct, either that they were aſhamed of their own performances, or afraid to be known as the authors of them. And whatever juſt reaſons they might have for the former, yet methinks they could have none for the latter, in this country and age of liberty; unleſs, perhaps, it were, that their libels might expoſe them to a legal proſecution, and ſubject them to pay conſiderable damages. But I ſhould not have taken this advantage of them, tho' they had prefixed their names to their abuſes. I have too much commiſeration for them, to wiſh them any other pain or trouble than what naturally attends ſuch degeneracy of mind, ſuch rancor of heart, as they have diſcovered. I ſhould accordingly have left them, with pity, to the *Nemeſis* within them, without ſeeking any further ſatisfaction for theſe repeated outrages; tho' more groſs in their kind, than any perſon in this country ever before received from the moſt licentious pens.

I ſhall not demean myſelf ſo far as to mention even the titles of moſt of the publications, to which I refer;

much

much leſs, take a particular notice of any thing contained in them: Eſpecially ſince the authors did not even pretend to enter into the merits of the cauſe, but made it their buſineſs, throughout, to defame and revile me. But there has lately appeared againſt me a pamphlet, containing two performances, the one intitled, *A Candid Examination*, the other, *A Letter to a Friend*; in both which there is an attempt, not merely to aſperſe my character, but to vindicate the conduct of the *Society* in the way of argument. This pamphlet has been brandiſhed about as a two-edged ſword; and cried up by the epiſcopal party, as a weapon, whoſe ſharpneſs and weight it was impoſſible to withſtand. And it might, perhaps, be thought by ſome, that I treated theſe performances with too great contempt, if I let them paſs intirely unnoticed; eſpecially conſidering how many readers there are, with whom mere fineſſe, chicanery and confidence have all the force of reaſon and evidence. It is indeed a doubt with me, whether they merit ſuch a diſtinction above the other performances; not merely becauſe they are, like them, nameleſs; but becauſe they bear ſo much reſemblance to them in point of perſonal abuſe and invective. Indeed the author of the former of them, the pretended *Candid Examination*, does, in effect, acknowledge himſelf to be neither a ſcholar nor a gentleman; by ſaying, (p. 1.) that my *Obſervations* did not "deſerve the "notice of either a gentleman or a ſcholar;" which is there aſſigned as the true reaſon, why they had not before "met with a full reply;" and why I have "been ſuffered to triumph *thus long* in my perform-"ance."——So that he who now undertakes to give ſuch "a full reply" to them, and to put an end to my ſuppoſed *long triumph*, implicitly allows, that neither of thoſe titles belongs to himſelf: Which, many who read his *Examination*, will probably be of opinion, is the moſt *candid* part of it. However, as it does not become me to write in form, on ſuch a ſubject, againſt any perſon but a ſcholar and gentleman, I ſhall at once conſult his reputation and my own ſo far, as to

take it for granted that he is *both*, and treat him accordingly; at leaſt as far as is conſiſtent with quoting, and remarking on divers paſſages in his performance, which may perhaps, maugre all my intended favour and courteſy to him, prove him to be *neither*.

In conformity to this profeſſed deſign, I ſhall intirely neglect many of his perſonal invectives againſt me, no ways affecting the merits of the cauſe; giving my attention chiefly to what concerns the main points in diſpute. By thus paſſing over much of the defamatory part of his performance, and attending principally to the argumentative, I ſhall at once do what is moſt for his honor, and greatly ſhorten my own labor. In conformity to the ſame declaration, let me here alſo take occaſion to acknowledge the great obligation which I am under to him, for the charitable deſign which he profeſſed, of *ſhewing me to myſelf*; the ſame friendly office which I attempted to do, I hope not in vain, for the ingenious gentleman, who was the occaſion of my writing the *Obſervations*. Self-knowledge is of the utmoſt importance. But ſome there are, alas! who appear ſo intirely ignorant of, and ſo determined not to know *themſelves*, that it were a vain thing to attempt the teaching them this moſt uſeful leſſon. I am glad this gentleman did not take me for one of theſe. And ſince he might think it ungenerous in me, after this, to imagine that he is one himſelf, he may be pleaſed to ſuppoſe that I intend him the like favor. It is my ſincere wiſh, that we may both know ourſelves: And if I do not *rebuke* him quite ſo *ſharply*, to this good end, as he has taken it upon him to *rebuke* me†; the reader is left to judge, whether this is to be aſcribed to the want of juſt occaſion, or to my greater lenity and moderation.

Let it be further premiſed here, that I ſhall touch but very curſorily on the general controverſy betwixt the church of England and proteſtant nonconformiſts thereto: Which, in my opinion, has already been blended more than was *neceſſary* with this diſpute about the *Society*; tho' they have really ſome relation to each

† *Candid Examination*, p. 69.

each other. The gentleman, againſt whom I firſt wrote, was the occaſion of my ſaying what I did, relative to the former controverſy. The two gentlemen, with whom I am now concerned, have gone ſtill farther into it; and conſequently ſtill farther from what I take to be the chief point of debate, with reference to the *Society*'s conduct. And when or where is this diſpute like to terminate, if it is not to be ended till we have run through the other controverſy; and ſettled the matter, which is moſt agreeable to the plan of the goſpel, and conſequently moſt eligible, modern epiſcopacy, and the worſhip and diſcipline of the church of England, or the preſbyterian, or congregational mode? I am, in my own mind, indeed, in no doubt as to this; neither do my antagoniſts appear to be ſo in their's. But tho' it ſhould be allowed, that they have the beſt ſide of this queſtion, (which I am very far from thinking) yet it would not follow from hence, that the Society have applied their charity and money in New-England according to the true intent of their charter; which was the only point I propoſed to debate; as is evident from the *Obſervations*. As to the other general controverſy, which theſe gentlemen ſeem deſirous to draw on, and to confound with this; it has been ſo often and ſo fully handled by thoſe who were, as I conceive, much our ſuperiors, (if they will pardon this ſuppoſition, as it reſpects themſelves) that I do not imagine either of us could produce any thing both new and material upon it. For which reaſon, as well as becauſe I do not take it to be the turning point between us, as to the *Society*'s conduct, I ſhall wave going into this wide field for the preſent. I do not, however, abſolutely preclude myſelf from the honor of waiting on theſe gentlemen hereafter, if they ſhould think it expedient to write particularly and profeſſedly upon this ſubject: Tho' it is ſtrictly true, how genteely ſoever they may *ſneer* at it, that I have a real *averſion* to controverſy; the occaſions of which I have heretofore avoided, when my ſentiments have been publickly attacked.

Let me further juſt remind my *candid Examiner*, that whereas he ſpeaks of my *long triumph*, during the five or ſix months (as I ſuppoſe) in which his "full reply" was preparing; we read of ſome whoſe *triumphing is ſhort*: The application of which ſhall be left to himſelf, and to our impartial readers.

SECTION I.

Of the ſuppoſed Inconſiſtency charged on the Author of the Obſervations, *in ſaying, he deſigned not to accuſe the* Society *of any* wilful, criminal *abuſe of their Truſt; and yet, as the* Examiner *aſſerts, endeavouring to prove them guilty thereof.*

THO' it appeared evident to me, that the *Society* had, in ſome reſpects, miſapplied their charitable fund; yet I thought it more juſt and reſpectful to them to impute this to any other cauſe, than to known, wilful diſhoneſty. Wiſe and good men are liable to errors in opinion, and to various prejudices, in affairs of ſuch a nature; the right management of which depends upon ſome circumſtances, which they may not be in a ſituation to be ſo well acquainted with, as many of their inferiors. Was it not therefore much more candid and decent in One, fully convinced that there had been a real miſapplication on the part of the *Society*, to attribute this to ſuch miſtakes and prejudices as the greateſt and beſt men are not wholly exempted from, than to the want of integrity, or to a wilful betraying of their truſt? Every perſon, I ſuppoſe, except the *candid Examiner*, will readily acknowledge this. He is much out of temper with me, for making this profeſſion of reſpect for the *Society*; and yet, as he ſays, at other times, charging them, either explicitly or implicitly, with diſhoneſty, and endeavouring to prove them guilty of it. At this he quar-

rels from p. 3. to p. 9. But my expreſſions, even as quoted by himſelf, p. 5. and 6. do not, by any means, amount to ſuch an accuſation as he ſuppoſes they do; and it was the leſs *candid* in him to endeavour to fix upon me an inconſiſtency in this reſpect, becauſe, as he acknowledges, I had repeatedly deſired that none of my expreſſions might be underſtood, as deſigned to charge the *Society* with a criminal abuſe of their truſt.

My expreſſions do indeed imply, what I ſtill take to be the truth of the caſe, *viz.* that the *Society* were *over-ſedulous* to promote the cauſe of epiſcopacy and the church of England in theſe parts; and *too much* under the influence of prejudice againſt us nonconformiſts. This I ſuppoſe to have been the unhappy and principal occaſion of their expending ſo much money in New-England, in a manner not warranted by their charter. And who does not know, that even very wiſe, honeſt and good men may have foibles of this kind; ſo as, in ſome caſes, to have their conduct unhappily influenced thereby? Or muſt we ſuppoſe that every perſon, who is too ſtrongly attached to the intereſt of a particular church or religious ſect, or too much ſet againſt others, and thereby led into ſome inſtances of miſconduct, is therefore a diſhoneſt man, and acts contrary to his known duty? Is this ſuppoſition conſiſtent, I will not ſay, with chriſtian charity, but with common *candor?* What then becomes of my ſuppoſed inconſiſtency, in which he triumphs? For ſurely this gentleman and ſcholar (as I have agreed to call him) will not deny, but that there may, in many caſes, be real miſconduct, and very great, proceeding from ſuch-like cauſes, where yet there is none that is known, wilful and criminal.

This *candid* gentleman ſays, p. 6. "Perhaps this "*conſiſtent* reaſoner will chuſe rather to ſay, that the "*Society* are miſled, and form their plan upon the "miſrepreſentations of their wicked miſſionaries. "Something like this is aſſerted," &c. And then he adds, p. 7. "But ſurely whatever repreſentations "theſe

" theſe miſſionaries have made, the *Society* muſt judge " whether the complying with *ſuch repreſentations* " was, or was not, conſiſtent with their charter; ſo " that notwithſtanding his ſtriving to palliate his ac- " cuſation of the *Society*, by caſting the odium of a " pretended miſapplication of their charity on the " miſſionaries, the *ſlander* will ſtill remain where he " at firſt placed it, on the *Society* themſelves." Now does he not here reaſon like a ſcholar indeed? Becauſe the *Society* muſt needs judge, whether their complying with *ſuch repreſentations*, however wrong in themſelves, was, or was not conſiſtent with their charter, therefore the ſuppoſed *ſlander* muſt needs fall upon them, not on the miſſionaries, or others, who may have deceived them! But why ſo? Is it expected that the *Society* ſhould be omniſcient, or infallible? Or are they juſtly culpable, if they act with integrity, according to the repreſentations of people in America, which they believe to be juſt? If I had intimated, that they muſt anſwer at their peril for any involuntary miſtakes which they might fall into, thro' miſrepreſentations from hence, might not the *Examiner* and the world have juſtly cenſured me? But this *candid* gentleman himſelf, it ſeems, will have the *Society* accountable for all impoſitions put on them by their miſſionaries or others here, which may have been the occaſion of miſleading them, whatever pains they take to be rightly informed;—for this ſubſtantial reaſon, that they *muſt judge, whether the complying with ſuch repreſentations was, or was not conſiſtent with their charter.* Upon which hard condition, this gentleman had probably rather be even one of thoſe " *wicked* miſſionaries" he ſpeaks of, than a member of the venerable *Society*; ſince, according to it, the latter are to anſwer for the faults of the former.

The truth of the matter, with reſpect to my ſuppoſed inconſiſtency in the forementioned reſpect, appears to me to be this: Tho' my direct charge againſt the *Society* aroſe no higher than that of a real miſ-

application

application of monies, which I never once attributed to known, wilful diſhoneſty; but repeatedly guarded againſt any ſuch conſtruction of my words; yet my *Examiner* ſeems to ſuppoſe that ſome of the arguments adduced by me, in ſupport of that general charge, if they prove any thing, prove more than I profeſſedly aimed at by them; *viz.* That this miſapplication muſt have been a known and wilful, and therefore highly criminal one. And this, I have reaſon to think, is the real opinion of ſome others beſides the *Examiner:* And of ſome, who will not draw the notable concluſion from hence, that he has done, namely, That therefore there is no real miſapplication in the caſe! But of this more in the next Section. Let it ſuffice for the preſent, that he had no ground to tax me with inconſiſtency, tho' my proofs had really ariſen higher than my charge, as I am far from ſaying they do, whatever others may ſuppoſe. And if he had had as much *candor* as the title of his performance promiſes, one would think he might have acknowledged this as an example of *mine*, inſtead of triumphing, as he does, in an imaginary ſelf-contradiction in me.

SECTION II.

Of a notable argument of the Examiner, *That if the* Society *have been guilty of any miſapplication of monies, it muſt have been* wilful; *and therefore, that, according to my conceſſions, the general charge of a miſapplication is groundleſs.*

THIS argument the *Examiner* labors, in his *labyrinthian* manner, from p. 9. to 18. The ſum of it, in few words, is this: That if the *Society* have been guilty of any miſconduct, it muſt be either owing to their want of a competent knowledge of the ſtate of religion in New-England, or to their not underſtanding

ſtanding the ſenſe and deſign of their own charter; or, laſtly, it muſt have been known and wilful. He endeavours at large to prove, it could be owing to neither of the former cauſes; and as to the latter, he ſays, I do not myſelf aſſign this as the true; but rather diſown it to have been a known and wilful miſapplication. Therefore, he ſays, they have not at all miſapplied monies.

That I have here given the true ſenſe of this refined, long-labor'd argument, may appear from the *Examiner*'s own words, where he ſums it up: He there ſays, he thinks it has "been prov'd, either that "the *Society* have not acted inconſiſtent with their "charter, or if they have done ſo, that it was *knowingly*, *wilfully* and *deſignedly* done." He proceeds, ſpeaking of himſelf: "The author thinks, *as all reaſonable men muſt think*, that the *Society* do very well "underſtand the deſign and meaning of their charter "—And alſo that they have a competent knowledge "of the ſtate of religion in the plantations. If theſe "two things are allowed, the concluſion will unavoidably be——either that the *Society* have *wilfully* miſconducted, or elſe, that there has been no "miſconduct in the caſe—That they have *wilfully* "miſconducted, the Dr. diſallows, THEREFORE "THERE HAS BEEN NO MISCONDUCT AT ALL.— "Here then the *argument* and imputation which the "Dr. has *caſt upon the Society*, drop of courſe," p. 17, 18. Now, not to obſerve, that he ſuppoſes, I *caſt arguments upon the Society*, as well as *imputations*; did ever any one meet with a pleaſanter, more *candid*, or more concluſive piece of reaſoning than this? Some ſhort remarks upon it will be ſufficient.

1. What I directly charged the *Society* with, and endeavoured to prove, was, a *real* miſapplication of monies in New England.

2. The juſtneſs and proof of this general charge depend not on the particular cauſe or occaſion of ſuch ſuppoſed miſapplication. Whether it were owing to any miſtakes about the religious ſtate of New England,

land, or to a miſconſtruction of any clauſe in the charter, or were known and wilful; or were owing to any other ſuppoſeable cauſe, if any there be, affects not the juſtice of the charge in general.

3. It was not, therefore, incumbent upon me, in the courſe of my argument, particularly and minutely to point out the true cauſe, or cauſes of this miſapplication: It was ſufficient to prove it real; as I did, even to the conviction of ſome ſenſible and candid epiſcopalians.

4. I am not, therefore, under obligation, tho' it were in my power, to invalidate his ſuppoſed clear proofs, that the *Society* were neither miſtaken about the ſtate of religion here, nor the ſenſe of any part of their charter; and that a miſapplication could not be owing to any thing leſs innocent than a wilful betraying their truſt. For,

5. If all this ſhould be conceded, what concluſion would naturally and juſtly follow herefrom, but one which, as I conceive, would be much more to my honor than to that of the *Society*, or to the advantage of the *Examiner*; *viz.* That I was too *candid* in ſuppoſing the miſconduct of the *Society* not to be known and wilful?

6. Whereas he ſays, I "diſallow" that it was known and wilful; this is rather too ſtrongly expreſſed; —as if I had labor'd that point, or at leaſt laid ſome ſtreſs upon it, in my argument. Neither of which I did; tho' I thought, and ſtill think, it was far more decent and charitable to allow, that tho' there was a miſapplication, yet it might *poſſibly* be undeſigned, than to aſſert, with the *candid Examiner*, that it *muſt* be known, wilful, and highly criminal.

7. If I have been too charitable in that conceſſion, as he ſeems to ſuppoſe; yet, methinks, both he and the venerable *Society* might "forgive me this wrong:" eſpecially if I ſhould ever be convinced, and make an humble acknowledgment of my fault therein. And indeed, all that he has ſaid in this argument, has a much greater tendency to induce me to make an acknow-

knowledgment of this ſort, than to convince me that my general charge was not well grounded, or ſufficiently proved.

8. As his argument here manifeſtly tends much leſs to confute me, than it does to fix upon the *Society* the heinous charge of betraying their important truſt, which my veneration for them would not allow me to bring againſt them; it may well be queſtioned, whether he will ever receive their thanks. He has, to the utmoſt of his power, in his great *candor*, utterly precluded both them and himſelf from ever pleading it, by way of apology for theſe miſapplications, that they proceeded from innocent miſtake only, and were not known, wilful and criminal. Let the diſcerning and impartial judge, whether he is not in duty bound humbly to aſk their pardon, as having contributed to fix on them a much higher charge than I ever brought, or deſigned to bring.

I am the more ſurpriſed at this conduct in the *Examiner*, becauſe he appears to have been aware of the tendency of his argument, by introducing the objection, tho' without anſwering it. "Some friend of "the Dr." ſays he, "may poſſibly here cry out, "What would this Remarker be at? The Dr. has "plainly proved that the *Society* have been guilty of "great miſconduct, have acted quite inconſiſtent with "the intent and deſign of their charter; and from a "principle of charity is willing to impute it to miſ-"information or *ignorance*;" [by the way, I uſed no ſuch indecent language as this *(ignorance)* concerning the *Society*] "while this writer, who affects to be the "friend of the *Society*, is labouring to defeat the Dr.'s "benevolent purpoſe, and ſeems as tho' he deſigned "to prove their miſconduct to be wilful." However *candid* the *Examiner* may be thought, for introducing this objection himſelf; yet, I believe, moſt of his readers will think him very impolitic therein, unleſs he could have given an anſwer to it, as plauſible at leaſt, as the objection itſelf is obvious and pertinent.

SEC-

SECTION III.

Of the ſuppoſed impeachment of the Lord Chancellor, &c. *implied in the aforeſaid imputation on the Society.*

THE *Examiner* in the courſe of his argument, deſigned to prove that the *Society*'s miſconduct, if real, is not to be imputed to miſtake, ſuggeſts that I groſly reflect on the judgment or uprightneſs of certain great, and juſtly revered perſonages, who are empowered to inſpect their Conduct. How genteely and *candidly* he ſpeaks of this, will beſt appear from his own words—"Doubtleſs," ſays he, "the Lord "Chancellor, the Chief Juſtices of the King's Bench "and Common Pleas, whoſe peculiar profeſſion it is, "may be ſuppoſed to underſtand the nature of in-"ſtruments of this kind [the charter.] And as the "*Society* are obliged to exhibit an annual account of "their proceedings to theſe very learned and worthy "perſons, it is ſurprizing that they ſhould ſuffer "them to proceed above 60 years, without once ac-"quainting them that their conduct was not agreeable "to the *letter and ſpirit* of their charter. That the "Society ſhould at laſt be obliged to a *profound* "*Critic* in New-England," &c. [p. 16, 17.] "It is "not the Society alone, who are thus unjuſtly *ar-*"*raigned* by theſe *licentious* pens, but the *integrity* and "*honor* of their inſpectors alſo, the Lord Chancel-"lor," &c. [p. 19.] It may be incumbent upon me to ſay a few words with reference to this invidious way of reaſoning.

It is not even pretended, that I dropped the leaſt diſreſpectful word, directly, of theſe great perſonages; but only the *Examiner* ſuppoſes, that I and others implicitly accuſe them, as wanting either in wiſdom

or

or integrity, or both. This, it is conceived, is both groundleſs and injurious. For,

However wiſe and upright they are; yet, whether the *Society* have, in all caſes, applied their charity according to the true intent of their charter, depends very eſſentially not merely upon an exact and critical knowledge of law, or the deſign of the charter, but upon the manner, and various circumſtances of places, perſons and things, in which their monies have been applied. It is apparently as neceſſary, in order to a right judgment in the caſe, that theſe ſhould be particularly known, adverted to and conſidered, as that the ſenſe and deſign of the charter ſhould be perfectly underſtood. Without this, perſons of the moſt conſummate wiſdom and integrity, ſuch as their Lordſhips are allowed to be, may *poſſibly* be under a miſtake with reference to theſe applications.

It may be ſuppoſed, I humbly conceive, with all due reverence to theſe right honourable perſons, involved in ſo much ſecular buſineſs, and at ſuch a diſtance from N. England, (even the civil and political ſtate of which has been ſo imperfectly known at home, till within a few years) that even they may *poſſibly* have had ſome conceptions, not exactly conformable to the true ſtate of religion here; upon which the propriety of the *Society*'s conduct, as was intimated before, may eſſentially depend.

Tho' the *Society*'s accounts, and an abſtract of their proceedings, are annually laid before their Lordſhips; yet it does not particularly appear from them, what the true ſtate of religion is in theſe parts. And may it not, without *arraigning* the *wiſdom*, *integrity* and *honor* of the Lord Chancellor, &c. be ſuppoſed that they put great *confidence in the Society?*—eſpecially if it be conſidered, that they may never have heard the propriety of their conduct called in queſtion, reſpecting the N. England miſſions? May they not be ſuppoſed to have taken it for granted, that all was well, right, and as it ought to be, without nicely ſcrutinizing into the affair? It is, I ſuppoſe, no unuſual thing,

thing, where there are no prior ſuſpicions or complaints of miſmanagement, in other caſes, for perſons of the greateſt wiſdom and juſtice to ſuffer abuſes to paſs uncenſured, upon a natural preſumption, that in ſuch caſes, there is no ground for cenſure. Indeed, if their Lordſhips had had the *Society*'s conduct with reſpect to N. England under their particular conſideration; and if it appeared that they were duly apprized of the moſt material objections that have been made againſt it; and after this, declared their approbation of it, as conformable to the true intent of their charter; common prudence might then require any private perſon to be ſilent upon the ſubject; ſince finding fault with theſe applications would, in this caſe, be implicitly to reflect upon the judgment of thoſe diſtinguiſhed perſonages. But it is, by no means, ſufficient to ſilence any conſiderate man, to reflect that the *Society* annually lay before them ſome brief account of their proceedings, which have hitherto paſs'd uncenſured. And when all circumſtances are duly conſidered, I apprehend no candid man, except my very *candid Examiner*, would build much upon this argument; much leſs tax me, for any thing ſaid in the *Obſervations*, with arraigning the "integrity and ho-"nor" of the Lord Chancellor, &c. This is only an argument *ad invidiam*; or of that kind in which my *Examiner*, not to ſay *Inquiſitor*, ſeems chiefly to delight.

SECTION IV.

Of the Examiner's *exceptions againſt the Author's conſtruction of the charter; and what he offered in ſupport thereof.*

THIS *acute* logician being apprehenſive that, thro' the dulneſs of his readers, what he had hitherto offered would be unſatisfactory to them, en-

ters upon an examination of my remarks on the charter; with a deſign to ſhew, that I had miſrepreſented its ſenſe. But, by way of introduction, he gives us a ſpecimen of his *candor*.

He inſinuates, or rather aſſerts, p. 19, 20. and elſewhere, that I made an unfair and diſhonourable uſe of what Mr. HOBART wrote upon this ſubject. This he cannot but know, is leſs ingenuous than what they who read his title page only, might have reaſonably expected from him. I expreſly gave Mr. HOBART credit for every Iota I had from him; having quoted him, as I remember, in ten or a dozen places; as well as acknowledged, in a more general way, that his book had "been of ſervice to me." Which, with any perſon of as much *candor* as the *Examiner* profeſſes, might have ſecured me againſt the diſhonourable imputation of plagiariſm. And unleſs he can produce ſome clear and ſubſtantial argument, beſides a general agreement with Mr. HOBART in ſentiment, to prove this charge; (which he has not attempted, and I challenge him to do) I leave him to conſider, what opinion our impartial readers muſt entertain of him.—

He alſo appears much diſguſted, becauſe I ſaid, Mr. HOBART had handled this argument in a manner becoming "a truly chriſtian *biſhop*." He ſays, I have "dubb'd him a biſhop," p. 18. And p. 19. he ſpeaks of the "*empty* honor of a biſhop, which I ar- "bitrarily confer on him," &c. But ſince I, at moſt, ſpoke of Mr. HOBART only as a *chriſtian* biſhop, in contradiſtinction from a biſhop of the eſtabliſhed church of England; and ſince, in his opinion, this ſeems to be but an *empty honor*, methinks he need not have been ſo much offended at it—He alſo reſents it, that I took no notice of Mr. BEACH's reply to Mr. HOBART. One reaſon of this was, that I did not think it merited any. And tho' he calls it a *judicious*, *maſterly* and *ſolid* Anſwer; it is my ſerious opinion, that if all the heads of the Rev. Miſſionaries in America were *conſolidated* into one, it would not be in the

power

power of that wonderful head to give *such* an answer to the piece he speaks of. But these things by the bye.

The *Examiner* appears in general to dislike what I gave as the sense of the charter; which, partly to shew his disapprobation of that, and partly to vent his *candor* at me, he calls Mr. HOBART's sense of it. But still it is not very easy, at least for me, to tell what he particularly disapproves of, in that sense of the charter, be it whose it will. But as it is very material to have a right understanding of the true sense, spirit and design of the charter, in order to form a right judgment of the *Society*'s conduct, I shall attend to what he says with reference thereto. And,

First, He taxes me with not adhering, myself, to the rule which I laid down for interpreting the charter; *viz.* That "nothing is to be supposed the ob-, "ject, or any part of the object of this charitable "and royal institution, but what plainly appears to "be really so, from the *very words* of the charter. "———The *words* of the charter itself must determine and limit the sense of the royal Grantor, and "consequently the legal power conferred," &c. Having quoted these passages, without directly finding fault with the rule laid down, he says, "We shall "see presently how far the Dr. adheres to his own "invariable rule of interpretation," p. 20. Very well. "He confesses that the *British plantations, or "the King's subjects were really the primary, mere im-"mediate object of this institution.*" The *Examiner* then demands, with great vivacity, "And pray why "not the *sole* and *intire* object of it? There is cer-"tainly no other object *particularly expressed* in the "charter, besides that of the king's subjects. He has "forgot what he asserted but a few lines before," &c. Let it be here observed,

1. That the *Society* themselves have all along supposed, they were allowed, and even obliged by their charter, to use means in order to the conversion of the American Indians.

2. If ſo, it muſt be by virtue of ſome particular clauſe or clauſes therein, or by the *very words* of the charter. For otherwiſe, what right have the *Society* to apply any part of their fund to this end?

3. The *words* of the charter clearly ſhew, that this was, in part, the deſign of their inſtitution. For tho' the Indians are not expreſly mentioned; yet, as I hinted in the *Obſervations*, thoſe words in the charter, "for the propagation of the goſpel *in thoſe parts*," manifeſtly refer to the heathens bordering on the plantations; and have ever been ſo underſtood. The Indians therefore plainly appear, *from the very words of the charter itſelf*, to have been in part the object of this inſtitution. This the *Examiner* does in effect allow, by ſaying, p. 22. "What is here ſaid is not "intended to prove that the *Society* have not a power "*by their charter* to propagate the goſpel among the "*heathen*," &c. How can they have ſuch a power *by their charter*, unleſs the very words of the charter, in a fair and obvious conſtruction, grant it to them? This, he knows, is all that I meant, when I ſpoke of the *words* of the charter itſelf, as what muſt determine and limit the ſenſe of the royal Grantor, and conſequently the legal power conferred, &c. What ground had he then, to accuſe me of departing from the invariable rule of interpretation, which I had laid down? But,

4. He attempts to evade the obvious meaning of that clauſe in the charter, "for the propagation of the "goſpel in thoſe parts;" in how *candid* and ſcholar-like a manner, the reader ſhall judge. "Is not the "deſign of that phraſe," ſays he, "*the propagation* "*of the goſpel*," [here he artfully ſuppreſſes the words, *in thoſe parts*] "*fully* anſwered, by preaching it to "thoſe of the king's ſubjects who ſeem to be aban-"doned to atheiſm and infidelity, and to thoſe other "*inferior ſubjects* the ſlaves? many of whom even in "N. England are yet in a ſtate of heatheniſm.—— "Is there a ſingle word about the heathen bordering "on our colonies? Why will he then *force* upon us "a de-

" a deſign which the charter does not mention?" p. 21, 22. I anſwer, The deſign of the phraſe aforeſaid, would not be *fully anſwered*, in the way that he ſuppoſes it would, tho' it would be *partly* anſwered. If the *Society* had wholly neglected the Indians *in theſe parts*, tho' a door was opened for chriſtianizing them, it might be juſtly ſaid, they had neglected one material part of their charge, according to the *very words*, and obvious ſenſe of their charter. For the words, " for propagating the goſpel *in thoſe parts*," muſt, in a fair and natural conſtruction, be ſuppoſed to mean, that it was their buſineſs and duty to ſpread the goſpel *in theſe parts*, as far as they ſhould have ability and opportunity for it; and, as was intimated before, they have ever been underſtood as referring to the heathen bordering on our colonies. And to deny this, as the *Examiner* implicitly does, becauſe Indians are not expreſly mentioned; and ſaying that the deſign of the phraſe aforeſaid would be *fully anſwered*, tho' the charity of the *Society* were confined to the king's ſubjects, would, I ſuppoſe, be thought a poor piece of chicanery in any perſon but a *candid Examiner*; and one who was " to " ſhew the Dr. the *ſophiſtry* of his argument; and " that the rule which he lays down for interpreting " the charter, would, if admitted, *exclude* the Society " from this good work," &c. p. 22. So far from this, that the *very words* of the charter manifeſtly bring the heathen bordering on the Britiſh colonies, within the deſign of this inſtitution. And where the charge of *ſophiſtry* ought to lie, is now ſubmitted to the intelligent reader. Let me juſt add here,

5. That my ſuppoſing the chriſtianizing of the Indian nations is comprehended, or rather principally deſigned in the aforeſaid clauſe, is by no means uſing ſuch a latitude of interpretation, as will equally, or at all authorize the *Society* in applying their revenues for the propagation of the church of England in thoſe places, where the people have already the means of religion in other *proteſtant communions*; and ſo are in no particular danger of falling into atheiſm or infide-

lity, or the errors of popery. This is what the *Examiner* ſeems to aim at, in the laſt-mentioned page. But it is unneceſſary to add any thing here, to what was ſaid in the *Obſervations*.

Secondly, The *Examiner* loudly exclaims, becauſe, in order to confirm that *catholic* interpretation which I had put upon the charter, I ſaid, "King WILLIAM "himſelf was bred up in the calviniſtic principles and "diſcipline, quite oppoſite in ſome reſpects to the "epiſcopal; and is generally ſuppoſed to have re-"tain'd *a regard* for the principles of his education "all along; tho' as King of England, and head of "that church, there was a neceſſity of his externally "conforming to its rites and diſcipline."—This was mentioned by me as one circumſtance, which might contribute to render it probable, that King WILLIAM did not underſtand the term *orthodox miniſters* in the charter, in the narrow, excluſive ſenſe of ſome epiſcopalians; as if it comprehended only miniſters of the eſtabliſh'd church of England. And here my rhetorical, as well as *candid Examiner* calls upon his reader to ſtop, and "indulge his aſtoniſhment;" adding, "Was this glorious Deliverer then a finiſhed hypo-"crite?" &c. &c. p. 23. I anſwer,

1. All who know any thing of me and my political opinions, know that I have the higheſt veneration for the memory of King WILLIAM, and that glorious revolution, which was the occaſion of eſtabliſhing the proteſtant ſucceſſion in the before-illuſtrious, and now royal houſe of *Hanover*. I wiſh the ſame could be truly ſaid of all the high-flying epiſcopalians among us——

2. My words reſpecting King WILLIAM do not at all imply, that he was an *hypocrite*, much leſs a *finiſh'd* one, as this gentleman intimates. For,

3. It is very ſuppoſeable, that he might retain a great regard for the principles of his education; and yet upon the whole, all circumſtances conſidered, have ſuch an opinion of the church of England, that he could, with a good conſcience, conform to its rites

and

and diſcipline. I have not ſagacity enough, whatever my *Examiner* has, to ſee the leaſt inconſiſtency between theſe things. And if the reader cannot, as it is preſumed he cannot, diſcern any, let him once again *indulge his aſtoniſhment*, that this *candid* gentleman ſhould make ſuch a tragical exclamation at ſo harmleſs a ſuppoſition, merely to bring an odium upon me, as if I tacitly accuſed King WILLIAM as a *finiſh'd hypocrite*. But,

4. The gentleman is very confident, in oppoſition to me, that King WILLIAM actually "looked upon "the miniſtry in the church of England as *orthodox*, "in *oppoſition* to thoſe who diſſent from the eſtabliſh-"ment," p. 23. His reaſon for this is very curious; and, if we may take his word, "a better evidence "could not be given," &c. Let us then ſee what this beſt evidence for the aforeſaid poſition is. Why, it is, "his giving a hundred pounds ſterling per an-"num——for *ſupporting* a miniſter of the church of "England in Boſton, and his beſtowing a valuable "library of books on King's Chapel in that town." To which is added, "his royal foundation of a col-"lege at Williamſburg."—Now, who can be ſo dull as not to perceive, that from theſe facts or premiſes this conſequence is logically drawn—Therefore King WILLIAM *looked upon the miniſtry in the church of England as orthodox, in* oppoſition *to thoſe who diſſent from the eſtabliſhment?* For how was it poſſible the good King ſhould be ſo liberal to thoſe that *needed*, if it had not been his opinion, that nonconformiſts to the eſtabliſhed church were *unorthodox?* And by the ſame way of reaſoning, will it not alſo follow, that all the gentlemen who, a few years ſince, ſubſcrib'd or contributed to the rebuilding of the aforeſaid King's Chapel in Boſton, had the like ſentiments of the miniſtry in the church of England, and looked on her clergy as orthodox, in *oppoſition* to Preſbyterians and Congregationaliſts; tho' ſome who, as I am informed, ſubſcribed for that purpoſe, have ever been known nonconformiſts to that church? And why might not

this gentleman as well argue, that every rich perſon who gives an alms to a poor churchman, certainly looks upon him and the church of England as orthodox, in contradiſtinction to all nonconformiſts? According to which rule, it is a queſtion whether there is a rich gentleman in Boſton, but what is a thorough-pac'd churchman in his heart; and even a great bigot.—What the *Examiner* adds, p. 25. about orthodoxy, heterodoxy and hereſy, with a view to confine the term orthodox to miniſters of the church of England, may, I believe, be very ſafely left without any reply; only referring the reader to what was ſaid upon this point in the *Obſervations*, Sect. II. and IX.

The *Examiner* having proceeded thus far with his ſhrewd objections againſt what I offered, relative to the ſenſe and deſign of the charter; did not like, as it ſeems, to reaſon ſo *cloſely* any longer on the ſame point. He therefore here quits the charter, to talk about *eſtabliſhments*; concerning which, he ſays, I have gone into a miſtake. And tho' he intimates, that I was not poſitive, and did not lay much ſtreſs upon what I occaſionally ſaid about eſtabliſhments; yet he has labor'd this matter for 13 pages together; *viz.* from p. 26. to p. 39. incluſive. Some farther notice will hereafter be taken of this *huge* parentheſis in the *Examiner*'s argument. But at preſent I ſhall pay my attention to what he ſays after it, againſt what I advanced, to ſhew and confirm the true ſenſe of the charter. Wherefore,

Thirdly, He ſeems much *diſpoſed to object* againſt the argument which I drew from the *name* of the *Society*; but after reading over, two or three times, what he ſays as to this matter, p. 40. I muſt confeſs myſelf ſo dull, as not to apprehend diſtinctly what he means, or objects againſt. The ſcope of what he ſays under this head, ſeems to be to prove what I never denied, *viz.* That the *Society*'s "inſtitution *admits* of the preſervation as well as the extenſion of the goſpel," &c. But if he intends to apply this, as doubtleſs he does,

does, to their ſupporting epiſcopal miſſionaries among us, where God's word and ſacraments are ſo duly adminiſtred; as if the charity of the *Society* was rightly beſtowed here, under the pretence of preſerving us from infidelity, atheiſm or popery; I muſt beg leave to think him miſtaken, and to ſay, that we are, and have all along been, even in much leſs apparent danger of being abandoned to theſe evils, and groſs errors, than the people of England. And if ſo, whatever expence the *Society* have been at, to ſupport and propagate the church of England here, conſidered in oppoſition to preſbyterianiſm, &c. has been a miſapplication; not conformable to their charter, or to their *name* or *title*, as a *Society* founded for the *propagation of the goſpel*.

Fourthly, He objects againſt what I ſaid of the Society's *ſeal*, by way of illuſtration. He is likewiſe ſo *candid* as to miſquote my words concerning the ſeal, (*Ex.* p. 41.) in order to make me ſpeak nonſenſe: But it ſo happens, that I have neither inclination, nor the leaſt *occaſion* to take the ſame liberty with his words, in divers places, in order to anſwer the like end. What I ſaid of the ſeal, was in order to ſhew, that it correſponded both to the name of the *Society*, and to that catholic ſenſe of the charter, which I had given; but not to ſuch a narrow, party deſign, as that of converting proteſtants of one denomination to another. This is literally true, and directly to the purpoſe; tho' he ſays, "It is not eaſy to imagine what this *proof* "was alledged for, ſince it either proves too much, "or elſe nothing at all to his purpoſe." By the way, I did not bring this for *proof*, but illuſtration; the diſtinction betwixt which, he either knows, or ought to have known. He goes on, "If it was deſigned to "*prove* that the *ſole* buſineſs of the *Society*, was to "carry the goſpel to the ſavages," &c. He knows, I never aſſerted, much leſs endeavoured to prove, by this or any other argument, that this was their *ſole* buſineſs.—"But if it was brought to prove, that the "converſion of the natives was one *part* of the deſign "of their inſtitution," &c. Neither was it *chiefly* for

for this end; but if he will needs have it intended for the *proof* of any point, in diſtinction from *illuſtration*, it was this; that ſuch a *catholic* ſenſe as I had mentioned, ought to be put upon the expreſſions in the charter; and not ſuch an illiberal one as many ſuppoſe; as if the *Society* were inſtituted, at leaſt in part, for propagating the church of England, in *oppoſition* to proteſtants of other denominations. And however difficult it may be for him, I believe it will be very eaſy for others, to conceive how what I ſaid of the ſeal, tends to confirm what I ſaid of the charter. And ſome may, perhaps, perceive alſo, that what he has offered upon this head, is mere evaſion, not argument.

Fifthly, The *Examiner* finds much fault with what I ſaid of the *ſermons* preached before the *Society*, in order to illuſtrate, and thereby to confirm the true deſign of their inſtitution. He ſays,—"This, like the "former inſtance produced by him, either juſtifies "the *Society*, or elſe is nothing at all to the purpoſe," p. 42. Why ſo? It follows, "For does not the Dr. "himſelf repreſent the deſign of their inſtitution to be "that of preſerving and propagating chriſtianity "among the King's ſubjects, and extending it alſo "to the heathen?" Certainly; theſe general expreſſions comprehend the whole deſign. But then, *preſerving* chriſtianity among the King's ſubjects, muſt be ſuppoſed to refer to ſuch places and colonies as are pointed out in the charter; *viz.* thoſe which greatly need this charitable proviſion; not thoſe in which a competent proviſion was before made for miniſters, and where the King's ſubjects already enjoyed God's word and ſacraments, ſo as not to be in any apparent danger of falling into atheiſm, infidelity or popery. This obſervation ſuggeſts the proper anſwer to the queſtion immediately following: "And has not this "been the very practice of the *Society* from the begin-"ning?" I never intimated, that they had not done much, according to the true intent of their charter, as it has been repreſented. But they have alſo done much beſide,

beſide, or beyond that intent, by ſupporting and propagating the church of England, in oppoſition to other proteſtant churches, at a great expence, where their charity was not needed; to the neglect of thoſe unhappy people pointed out in their charter, as the proper, and only proper objects of their charitable care.

The *Examiner* proceeds: "And what do the anni-"verſary ſermons imply, but certain exhortations to "purſue the ſeveral objects of their inſtitution?" If this is *all they imply*, they are directly to my purpoſe; and do not in the leaſt tend to *juſtify the Society*, as he ſuppoſes; ſince they have purſued certain objects, which do not appear to have been originally objects of their inſtitution. He adds,—"Thoſe which the Dr. "has quoted inſiſt chiefly upon one topic, while other "ſermons preached upon the ſame occaſion enlarge "upon ſome other branch of the general deſign."

Let it be here obſerved,

1. That my citations, (Sect. IV.) were expreſly made, as ſpecimens of the *general ſtrain* and *tenor* of thoſe ſermons; for which I appealed to thoſe who are converſant in them. But yet,

2. This *candid* gentleman has not ſhewn, and is now challenged to ſhew, *any one branch of the general deſign*, which is not obviouſly contained in thoſe quotations. *That* from the excellent biſhop BUTLER ſpeaks expreſly of keeping up "the profeſſion of chriſtianity "in our factories abroad, and the colonies to which "we are related,"—of the *ſlaves*, and "taking care "for *their* religious inſtruction." And it is added, "The like charity we owe to the *natives*." Now, what branch of the general deſign is not fairly and clearly comprehended in theſe expreſſions, in conformity to what was obſerved immediately after this citation? *viz.* "*Thus Dr.* BUTLER, *with his uſual penetration and accuracy, repreſents the true deſign of this noble inſtitution, in its* whole view, compaſs *and* extent."

3. I alſo intimated, that ſome of the ſermons ſpeak of more than the charter does, or warrants; *viz.* propagating the church of England in *oppoſition* to that mode,

for this end; but if he will needs have it intended for the *proof* of any point, in diſtinction from *illuſtration*, it was this; that ſuch a *catholic* ſenſe as I had mentioned, ought to be put upon the expreſſions in the charter; and not ſuch an illiberal one as many ſuppoſe; as if the *Society* were inſtituted, at leaſt in part, for propagating the church of England, in *oppoſition* to proteſtants of other denominations. And however difficult it may be for him, I believe it will be very eaſy for others, to conceive how what I ſaid of the ſeal, tends to confirm what I ſaid of the charter. And ſome may, perhaps, perceive alſo, that what he has offered upon this head, is mere evaſion, not argument.

Fifthly, The *Examiner* finds much fault with what I ſaid of the *ſermons* preached before the *Society*, in order to illuſtrate, and thereby to confirm the true deſign of their inſtitution. He ſays,—"This, like the "former inſtance produced by him, either juſtifies "the *Society*, or elſe is nothing at all to the purpoſe," p. 42. Why ſo? It follows, "For does not the Dr. "himſelf repreſent the deſign of their inſtitution to be "that of preſerving and propagating chriſtianity "among the King's ſubjects, and extending it alſo "to the heathen?" Certainly; theſe general expreſſions comprehend the whole deſign. But then, *preſerving* chriſtianity among the King's ſubjects, muſt be ſuppoſed to refer to ſuch places and colonies as are pointed out in the charter; *viz.* thoſe which greatly need this charitable proviſion; not thoſe in which a competent proviſion was before made for miniſters, and where the King's ſubjects already enjoyed God's word and ſacraments, ſo as not to be in any apparent danger of falling into atheiſm, infidelity or popery. This obſervation ſuggeſts the proper anſwer to the queſtion immediately following: "And has not this "been the very practice of the *Society* from the begin-"ning?" I never intimated, that they had not done much, according to the true intent of their charter, as it has been repreſented. But they have alſo done much beſide,

beſide, or beyond that intent, by ſupporting and propagating the church of England, in oppoſition to other proteſtant churches, at a great expence, where their charity was not needed; to the neglect of thoſe unhappy people pointed out in their charter, as the proper, and only proper objects of their charitable care.

The *Examiner* proceeds: "And what do the anni-"verſary ſermons imply, but certain exhortations to "purſue the ſeveral objects of their inſtitution?" If this is *all they imply*, they are directly to my purpoſe; and do not in the leaſt tend to *juſtify the Society*, as he ſuppoſes; ſince they have purſued certain objects, which do not appear to have been originally objects of their inſtitution. He adds,—"Thoſe which the Dr. "has quoted inſiſt chiefly upon one topic, while other "ſermons preached upon the ſame occaſion enlarge "upon ſome other branch of the general deſign."

Let it be here obſerved,

1. That my citations, (Sect. IV.) were expreſly made, as ſpecimens of the *general ſtrain* and *tenor* of thoſe ſermons; for which I appealed to thoſe who are converſant in them. But yet,

2. This *candid* gentleman has not ſhewn, and is now challenged to ſhew, *any one branch of the general deſign*, which is not obviouſly contained in thoſe quotations. *That* from the excellent biſhop BUTLER ſpeaks expreſly of keeping up the profeſſion of chriſtianity "in our factories abroad, and the colonies to which "we are related,"—of the *ſlaves*, and "taking care "for *their* religious inſtruction." And it is added, "The like charity we owe to the *natives*." Now, what branch of the general deſign is not fairly and clearly comprehended in theſe expreſſions, in conformity to what was obſerved immediately after this citation? *viz.* "*Thus Dr.* BUTLER, *with his uſual penetration and accuracy, repreſents the true deſign of this noble inſtitution, in its* whole view, compaſs *and* extent."

3. I alſo intimated, that ſome of the ſermons ſpeak of more than the charter does, or warrants; *viz.* propagating the church of England in *oppoſition* to that mode,

mode, or thoſe modes of proteſtantiſm, which are generally profeſſed and practiſed in New-England. Of this a ſpecimen was afterwards given from Dr. BEARCROFT's ſermon; tho' in ſome other of theſe ſermons, ſuch a deſign and conduct are at leaſt implicitly condemned: Of which ſome examples were alſo given in the citations from two biſhops of St. Aſaphs, and from Dr. WADDINGTON. Was not this a fair way of proceeding? or what would my *Examiner* have had me done? Why, he ſays,—"If the Dr. had intended to "have drawn an argument from theſe ſermons, in "proof of the general deſign of their inſtitution, he "ſhould have formed an abſtract from them ALL, ſo "far at leaſt as they have enlarged upon different to-"pics; and have given us the collective ſenſe of the "whole. But this indeed would not have *ſerved his* "*turn*," &c. p. 43. But till he can ſhew ſome one branch of the original deſign, which is not clearly expreſſed in my quotations, his objecting in this manner will, perhaps, be thought much leſs *candid* than *captious*, by intelligent readers: And what *turn* he may have to *ſerve* by it, all are left to conjecture.

But the gentleman may poſſibly think I do not pay a due attention to his *critical* ſagacity, unleſs I take ſome notice of a ſpecimen of it, in what he ſays in this part of the *Examination*. I ſaid in the *Obſervations*, "The preachers upon theſe occaſions ſeem "evidently, however, to have had the heathen in their "minds, rather than profeſſed chriſtians, who only "needed aſſiſtance in order to the ſupport of God's "worſhip and ordinances: *In which reſpect* the ſer-"mons rather coincide with the *ultimate* than the "more *immediate* deſign of the inſtitution; and ſo "harmonize *rather more*, perhaps, with the ſeal and "name of the *Society*, than with the charter." [Becauſe (as I imagined every intelligent reader would underſtand me) the charter dwells chiefly, not upon the *ultimate*, but the more *immediate* deſign of the inſtitution; i. e. not upon the converſion of heathens, but the aſſiſtance of the King's ſubjects in the colonies.]

The

The *Examiner* having quoted a part of this paſſage, which relates to the ſermons in general, not particularly to thoſe cited by me, as he has repreſented it, (tho' I will not ſay, to *ſerve a turn)* criticizes upon it thus: "What now are we to learn from hence, but that "the ſeal and name of the Society, which a little "before he had produced to explain and ſupport his "ſenſe of the charter, do really *not harmonize with it* "*at all*, but only with the ſermons *he has quoted?* So "all he had been offering before by way of proof, "from the name and ſeal of the *Society*, is now given "up again, as being (what indeed it is) nothing to "the purpoſe. This gentleman has a very ſtrange "method of proving and diſproving, of aſſerting and "giving up again. Sure he could never expect to "arrive at any ſolid concluſion by this *wanton* me-"thod of arguing," p. 42, 43. Now, is not this very ſmartly and vivaciouſly ſaid? But,

1. It was to my purpoſe, if the name and ſeal of the *Society* correſpond to *either part* of the general deſign of the inſtitution, as repreſented in the charter: And I obſerved that they certainly did ſo; more eſpecially to *that part* of the deſign, chriſtianizing the heathens.

2. This I neither gave up nor contradicted, by ſaying that the ſermons harmonized *rather more*, *perhaps*, with the name and ſeal of the Society, than with the charter; which chiefly dwells on the primary, and more immediate object of the inſtitution. For,

3. They may all harmonize together, and yet ſome of them harmonize *rather more* exactly than others: A leſs perfect harmony implies no contradiction or repugnancy, but a *real* agreement.

4. Upon what ground then does this *candid* gentleman ſay, that in the paſſage aforeſaid, I repreſent the ſeal and name of the *Society* as not harmonizing *at all* with the charter, contrary to what I had juſt been ſhewing?—that I gave this up again?—proving and diſproving, and uſing *a wanton method of arguing?* It would be to his credit if theſe poſitions, ſo *alertly* thrown

thrown out, did not more clearly diſcover *ſomething elſe*, than either his *candor*, or his ſagacity and critical ſkill, whatever he may imagine.

But he taxes me with treating the anniverſary ſermons with "great indecency" alſo. This, he ſays, "will appear to any one who conſults my 13th, 14th, "and 15th ſections, as well as many other paſſages "in my book," p. 43. I own, I ſpoke with great contempt of certain paſſages in one of theſe ſermons, Sect. 13th, as ſavouring ſtrongly of bigotry: For which there was ſufficient reaſon. But there is nothing in the two other ſections to which he refers, that can, I think, be juſtly conſtrued into a reflection on theſe ſermons. And he may pleaſe to remember, that I ſpoke of the anniverſary ſermons in general, in a very reſpectful manner, before I began my citations from them. "I have read many of theſe *excellent ſermons*, both the very earlieſt," &c.

Let it be here obſerved, that the *Examiner* has thought proper intirely to paſs over one material remark which I made upon theſe anniverſary ſermons, particularly biſhop BUTLER's, which takes in the *whole* deſign of the inſtitution. It was to this purpoſe; That in theſe ſermons good men of *all denominations* are called on to help forward the pious work of the *Society*, as marked out in the charter: Which exhortation, tho' of great weight, ſo long as the original inſtitution is kept to; yet loſes its propriety and force, when conſidered as addreſſed to nonconformiſts, to perſuade them to aſſiſt the *Society* in ſupporting and propagating the church of England in theſe parts, in oppoſition to the modes of worſhip and diſcipline which generally prevail here. It will not be amiſs here to ſubjoin one obſervation of conſiderable moment, which did not occur to me when I was writing before; *viz.* That ſeveral of the members, and *original* Grantees of the *Society*, were nonconformiſts. Such, in particular, as I ſuppoſe, were *John Hooke*, Eſq; ſerjeant at law, *Grey Neville*, Eſq; Mr. *Hodges*, merchant, and *Peter King*, afterwards Lord Chancellor, and

and doubtleſs then an occaſional conformiſt; author of the learned *Inquiry into the Conſtitution, Diſcipline, Unity and Worſhip of the primitive Church*; ſo different, in many reſpects, from that of the church of England. And ſurely it cannot be ſuppoſed that theſe or other nonconformiſts would have joined in any deſign, one branch of which was, to ſupport and propagate the church of England in the colonies, in oppoſition to Preſbyterianiſm, &c. Which, as is now pretended by many, was one principal and original object of this inſtitution.

Whether my *Examiner* has, or has not ſaid any thing of weight, to invalidate what I offered in order to fix the true ſenſe of the charter, in oppoſition to that narrow, uncatholic one, which confines orthodoxy to the church of England, and which ſuppoſes us nonconformiſts thereto, to be deſtitute of God's word and ſacraments, ſo as to ſeem *abandoned* to atheiſm and infidelity, or in imminent danger of being perverted to popery: This is ſubmitted to the judgment of the intelligent and impartial: If he has not done this, he has hitherto done nothing to purpoſe.

SECTION V.

Of what the Examiner *ſays of the* eſtabliſhment *of the Church of England in theſe Colonies.*

I NOW return to what the gentleman ſays of *eſtabliſhments*, from p. 26 to 39. incluſive: So large a proportion of his pamphlet is taken up in an attempt to prove, that the church of England is, and that our congregational churches are not, eſtabliſhed here. Something ſhall be offered reſpecting both; and in this ſection, concerning the former. Tho' it was ſaid, *en paſſant*, in the *Obſervations*, that the church of England was not eſtabliſhed here; yet he knows that

that I did not make a point of this. Poſſibly I was miſtaken; tho' I ſpoke as I thought, and, was never backward to retract an error, when fully convinced of it:

"Not free from faults, nor yet too vain to mend."

I had before read all that the *Examiner* has produced, of any conſequence, to prove the eſtabliſhment of the church of England in the colonies. This is contained in an anonymous letter to a Rev. gentleman in this town, printed in 1745, and ſigned J. F. I have carefully read ſaid letter ſince, and been at the pains to look over the ſeveral ſtatutes cited therein; but without being ſatisfied, that the ingenious author of it has proved his point. However, I will not poſitively deny it, or undertake to prove the contrary. But as I do not yet ſee reaſon to retract my former opinion, it may naturally be expected, that I ſhould at leaſt aſſign *ſome* of the reaſons why I remain unconvinced, by what is contained in the letter aforeſaid. This ſhall be done with ſuch diffidence of my own opinion, as might perhaps as well have become the *Examiner*, as the great confidence which he has expreſſed. Mr. BEACH, whoſe reply to Mr. HOBART he ſo highly extols, leaves this as a doubtful point, to be diſcuſſed by gentlemen of the law. But to return.

The ſenſible, and, I ſuppoſe, learned author of the letter aforeſaid, before he ſpeaks particularly of the ſtatutes, ſays, "The chriſtian religion, as by its evi- "dence and intrinſic excellency, it recommended it- "ſelf to the Engliſh government, ſo it became by "law the religion of the Engliſh nation; and the "church of England became by law their national "church: And when any part of the Engliſh nation "ſpread abroad into colonies, as they continued a "part of the nation, the law oblig'd them equally to "the church of England, and to the chriſtian reli- "gion." I crave leave, with all proper deference to the opinion of others, particularly of thoſe who have made law their principal ſtudy, to remark here,

1. That when the gentleman ſays, the law obliges the Engliſh colonies "*equally* to the church of Eng- "land, and to the chriſtian religion," his meaning undoubtedly is, that it *really* obliges them to both; and not more to one than to the other.

2. This reaſoning is partly grounded on the ſuppoſition, that the particular mode or form of chriſtianity, which is eſtabliſhed in the mother country, is not of a more *local* nature than chriſtianity itſelf; which, the gentleman very juſtly obſerves, "by its *evidence*, "and *intrinſic* excellency, recommended itſelf to the "Engliſh government." For if one be more local than the other, would it be properly ſaid, the law obliges the colonies *equally* to both?

3. The whole force of the argument, it is conceived, lies here, that colonies emigrating from the Engliſh nation, *continue a part of the nation.*

4. If the reaſoning in this paſſage will hold good, this is a ſhort and eaſy way of putting an end forever to the queſtion about the eſtabliſhment of the church of England here. For, that the ſaid church is the eſtabliſh'd religion of the Engliſh nation, of which the colonies thence derived *continue a part*, no one in the leaſt doubts. So that if this *alone* is ſufficient to render the eſtabliſh'd religion of England, the eſtabliſh'd religion out of England alſo, there is no more to be ſaid. But yet, it ſeems, the author of ſaid letter did not chuſe to reſt the cauſe upon the ſtrength of this argument; for he no ſooner mentions than he leaves it, and has recourſe to particular ſtatutes, from the language of which he endeavours to prove that the church of England is eſtabliſhed, not only in England, &c. but in the colonies themſelves. What occaſion was there for this labor, if it be a clear point, that the laws of England are in their nature binding on all *parts of the nation*, ſpread abroad in colonies, even tho' they are not particularly expreſſed or regarded in the ſtatutes?

5. According to this way of reaſoning, it will follow, that *all* the laws of England, without exception,

whether prior or poſterior to the eſtabliſhment of colonies, are obligatory upon the people in them, as much as if they actually lived in England: (I mean, unleſs they ſhould, in ſome caſes, be *expreſly* exempted from the power of them) For if we are bound by them, *merely* as they are the laws of that nation, of which we are a *part*; this reaſon will hold as well with reſpect to thoſe laws which were ſubſequent to our emigration, as to thoſe that were anterior thereto; ſince we are ſtill *equally* a part of the nation. On the other hand,

6. If this would be an inſufficient reaſon or ground of obligation in *one* caſe; or if *any* of theſe laws are not binding upon us *merely* as they are the laws of that nation of which we are a *part*; then this will be an inadequate, or inſufficient reaſon, conſidered in itſelf, in *all* other caſes whatſoever; and particularly with reſpect to the eſtabliſhed church of England. For if there be *any* caſe in which the laws of England, as ſuch, are not binding on the people of the colonies, tho' they continue to be a *part* of the nation; it is from hence evident, that ſomething further is neceſſary to render *any* of them binding, beſides this, that they are the laws of England.

7. It will not, I conclude, be aſſerted, that *all* the laws of England, without exception, or of Great Britain, are, as ſuch, binding on the colonies. In order to their being ſo, it muſt, I humbly conceive, plainly appear from the language of them, or from their very nature, that they were formally deſigned for all the King's ſubjects, as well thoſe in the colonies as thoſe in England. Many of the laws of England are in their own nature local, ſo that they cannot poſſibly be obeyed out of England. And I am informed by thoſe that are learned in the laws, and in the cuſtoms and uſages of the colonies, that it is a clear, indiſputable point, that there are many Engliſh ſtatutes, *in other caſes*, which are not binding on the colonies. So that it ſeems to be only the *common law* at moſt, and thoſe ſtatutes that are made in affirmation or explanation of it, that Engliſh ſubjects carry with them when they emigrate

emigrate into colonies, ſo as to be bound by them. And I conclude, it will not be ſaid that the church of England is eſtabliſhed by common law, which had its origin among *heathen* nations; and was compleat as a ſyſtem long before the reformation.

8. That this is, in general, the ſenſe of the Britiſh parliament, appears at leaſt probable from hence, That in many ſtatutes the colonies or plantations are expreſly mentioned, in others not; in ſome of them, ſome particular colonies, but not others: in ſome of them Ireland, but not in others. Does not this ſhew, that the King and parliament conſider the ſtatutes of England as being of no force in the colonies, unleſs they are expreſly mentioned, or at leaſt, unleſs the ſtatutes are conceived in ſuch terms as clearly and indiſputably comprehend them?*

9. This will farther appear to be the ſenſe of parliament, from an act of the 21ſt of GEO. II. intitled, *An Act for avoiding and putting an end to certain doubts and queſtions, relating to the atteſtation of wills*, &c. This act refers to another in the 29th CH. II. relating to the ſame ſubject; and contains theſe words: "And "whereas in *ſome* of the Britiſh colonies or plantations

* Acts of parliament deſigned to bind the plantations are uſually expreſſed in the following manner—"Any of the colonies or plantations in *America*, under his Majeſty's dominion." [6. 9. 2. C. 13.] "Any colonies or plantations of his Majeſty, in *Aſia*, *Africa* or *America*."—"Any lands, iſlands, plantations or territories to his Majeſty belonging, or in his poſſeſſion, or which may hereafter belong, or be in poſſeſſion of his Majeſty, his heirs and ſucceſſors, in *Aſia*, *Africa* or *America*." [See 12 C. 2. c. 18. and the acts of *Trade* in general.] "Good and profitable acts of parliament made in the realm of England ſince the reign of K. John, extended not to Ireland, unleſs," &c. [4 Inſt. 351.] "In acts of parliament, Ireland," [even tho' a *conquered* country] "ſhall not be bound without *expreſs words*, tho' the *nature* and *reaſon* of the act extends to Ireland." [Skin. 519.]—"They in Jamaica," [call'd a conquered iſland] "having power to *make* new laws, *our* general laws may be *altered by theirs* in particulars."—[Holt C. J. and the court, in the caſe of Blan. and Gald.] With how much advantage may all this be applied to theſe charter colonies, which have a legiſlative power, and which were ſettled and cultivated to the great benefit of the crown and kingdom, *at the ſole charge of the adventurers?*

whether prior or poſterior to the eſtabliſhment of colonies, are obligatory upon the people in them, as much as if they actually lived in England: (I mean, unleſs they ſhould, in ſome caſes, be *expreſly* exempted from the power of them) For if we are bound by them, *merely* as they are the laws of that nation, of which we are a *part*; this reaſon will hold as well with reſpect to thoſe laws which were ſubſequent to our emigration, as to thoſe that were anterior thereto; ſince we are ſtill *equally* a part of the nation. On the other hand,

6. If this would be an inſufficient reaſon or ground of obligation in *one* caſe; or if *any* of theſe laws are not binding upon us *merely* as they are the laws of that nation of which we are a *part*; then this will be an inadequate, or inſufficient reaſon, conſidered in itſelf, in *all* other caſes whatſoever; and particularly with reſpect to the eſtabliſhed church of England. For if there be *any* caſe in which the laws of England, as ſuch, are not binding on the people of the colonies, tho' they continue to be a *part* of the nation; it is from hence evident, that ſomething further is neceſſary to render *any* of them binding, beſides this, that they are the laws of England.

7. It will not, I conclude, be aſſerted, that *all* the laws of England, without exception, or of Great Britain, are, as ſuch, binding on the colonies. In order to their being ſo, it muſt, I humbly conceive, plainly appear from the language of them, or from their very nature, that they were formally deſigned for all the King's ſubjects, as well thoſe in the colonies as thoſe in England. Many of the laws of England are in their own nature local, ſo that they cannot poſſibly be obeyed out of England. And I am informed by thoſe that are learned in the laws, and in the cuſtoms and uſages of the colonies, that it is a clear, indiſputable point, that there are many Engliſh ſtatutes, *in other caſes*, which are not binding on the colonies. So that it ſeems to be only the *common law* at moſt, and thoſe ſtatutes that are made in affirmation or explanation of it, that Engliſh ſubjects carry with them when they emigrate

emigrate into colonies, ſo as to be bound by them. And I conclude, it will not be ſaid that the church of England is eſtabliſhed by common law, which had its origin among *heathen* nations; and was compleat as a ſyſtem long before the reformation.

8. That this is, in general, the ſenſe of the Britiſh parliament, appears at leaſt probable from hence, That in many ſtatutes the colonies or plantations are expreſly mentioned, in others not; in ſome of them, ſome particular colonies, but not others: in ſome of them Ireland, but not in others. Does not this ſhew, that the King and parliament conſider the ſtatutes of England as being of no force in the colonies, unleſs they are expreſly mentioned, or at leaſt, unleſs the ſtatutes are conceived in ſuch terms as clearly and indiſputably comprehend them?*

9. This will farther appear to be the ſenſe of parliament, from an act of the 21ſt of GEO. II. intitled, *An Act for avoiding and putting an end to certain doubts and queſtions, relating to the atteſtation of wills*, &c. This act refers to another in the 29th CH. II. relating to the ſame ſubject; and contains theſe words: "And "whereas in *ſome* of the Britiſh colonies or plantations

* Acts of parliament deſigned to bind the plantations are uſually expreſſed in the following manner— "Any of the colonies or plantations in *America*, under his Majeſty's dominion." [6. 9. 2. C. 13.] "Any colonies or plantations of his Majeſty, in *Aſia*, *Africa* or *America*."—"Any lands, iſlands, plantations or territories to his Majeſty belonging, or in his poſſeſſion, or which may hereafter belong, or be in poſſeſſion of his Majeſty, his heirs and ſucceſſors, in *Aſia*, *Africa* or *America*." [See 12 C. 2. c. 18. and the acts of *Trade* in general.] "Good and profitable acts of parliament made in the realm of England ſince the reign of K. John, extended not to Ireland, unleſs," &c. [4 Inſt. 351.] "In acts of parliament, Ireland," [even tho' a *conquered* country] "ſhall not be bound without *expreſs words*, tho' the *nature* and *reaſon* of the act extends to Ireland." [Skin. 519.]—"They in Jamaica," [call'd a conquered iſland] "having power to *make* new laws, *our* general laws may be *altered by theirs* in particulars."—[Holt C. J. and the court, in the caſe of Blan. and Gald.] With how much advantage may all this be applied to theſe charter colonies, which have a legiſlative power, and which were ſettled and cultivated to the great benefit of the crown and kingdom, *at the ſole charge of the adventurers?*

" in America, the ſaid act of the 29th of King CH. " II. has been *received* for law, or *acts of aſſembly* " have been made, whereby the atteſtation and ſub- " ſcription of witneſſes to devices of lands, *&c.* have " been required; therefore, to prevent and avoid " doubts which may ariſe in the ſaid colonies or plan- " tations—Be it enacted,—That this act, and every " clauſe, matter and thing therein contained, ſhall " extend to *ſuch* of the ſaid colonies and plantations, " *where* the ſaid act is *by act of aſſembly* MADE, or *by* " *uſage* RECEIVED *as law.*"—Can there be a clearer proof than this, that the King and parliament of Britain do not conſider *all* acts of parliament in general as binding upon the colonies; but only thoſe of them, which either plainly and expreſly extend to the plantations, or which are afterwards, " by act of aſſembly " *made*, or by uſage *received* as law?" It may be farther obſerved, that in ſome caſes particular acts of parliament have been made, expreſly extending certain clauſes of former ſtatutes to the plantations; either becauſe they were not originally deſigned to extend to them, or becauſe that deſign was not clearly enough expreſſed in the ſtatutes themſelves. What occaſion for this, if it was ſuppoſed, or ought to be taken for granted, that all the ſtatutes in general are binding on the colonies, *merely* as they are the laws of that nation, of which they are *a part?* I ſhould be obliged to my candid *Examiner*, or to the author of the aforeſaid letter (J. F.) if he would fairly reconcile theſe things with the principle advanced therein, That the ſtatutes are binding on the colonies, merely becauſe they " continue *a part* of the nation." Till this is done, I muſt beg leave to conſider that poſition, not only as without ſupport, but as directly contrary to the expreſs ſenſe of parliament.

10. There is great and manifeſt reaſon, why the ſtatutes in general ſhould not extend, or be ſuppoſed to extend to the colonies, unleſs the colonies are either expreſly mentioned, or clearly and indiſputably comprehended in the terms of them. This reaſon is in general

general founded in the very wide difference of circumſtances, in numberleſs reſpects, between the mother-country and the colonies: Which reaſon, it ſhould be obſerved, will *equally* take place with reference to the ſtatutes that were *anterior*, and thoſe that were *poſterior* to the being of the colonies. And there is one very peculiar reaſon, which ſhall be mentioned hereafter, why the ſtatutes relative to the church of England, ſhould not be ſuppoſed to extend to New-England.

But the author of the letter, (J. F.) as was intimated before, does not appear willing to riſque much upon the validity of his reaſoning in the paſſage which occaſioned the foregoing remarks. He therefore proceeds to the ſtatutes themſelves; endeavouring to ſhew, from the *very terms* of them, that they eſtabliſh the church of England in the colonies: which would have been an unneceſſary labor, if, according to his other argument, they were in their nature binding on all the colonies emigrating from, and continuing a part of, the Engliſh nation. He refers to, and partly quotes ſeven ſtatutes in order to prove his point: I beg leave to make a few curſory remarks upon them.

1. Thoſe of EDWARD VI. and Q. ELIZABETH were prior to the *being* of the New-England colonies. And therefore, tho' when they were made, they extended to *all the dominions*; yet it may well be doubted, whether they ought to be extended to any countries which did not then actually make a part of the dominions: I mean, if theſe ſtatutes are conſidered by themſelves, or independently of any poſterior to them, by which they are extended to ſuch parts or countries, as did not, at the time of making them, fall within the dominions. I am informed that ſome other ancient ſtatutes, tho' expreſſed in ſimilar terms, ſo far as regards their locality, are not now ſuppoſed to touch the plantations.

2. Tho' the ſtatute 14th CAR. II. commonly called the *Act of uniformity*, which is the next mentioned, confirms the ſtatutes aforeſaid; yet it may well be doubted, whether it extends them farther than they

were originally extended; I mean, ſo as to bring any country or countries within the religious eſtabliſhment, which were not a part of the Engliſh dominions in the time either of EDWARD VI. or ELIZABETH. It is by no means a clear point, that ſuch a confirmation of them actually *enlarges* their extent, by taking in all that belonged to the dominions at the time of ſuch confirmation. And if this had been the real deſign of the ſaid act, is it not at leaſt highly probable that it would have been expreſſed, or that the plantations which had been made in the intermediate time between Q. ELIZABETH and CH. II. would have been expreſly included in the eſtabliſhment now confirmed? Neither of which is the caſe: But, on the contrary,

3. This very act plainly *limits* the eſtabliſhment, by the very terms of it. For three ſeveral times at leaſt, the locality of the eſtabliſhment now confirmed, is expreſſed ſo as not only not to include, but to exclude the colonies. Once it is expreſſed and defined in theſe words:—"within the kingdom of England, domi-"nion of Wales, and town of Berwick upon Tweed." It is afterwards expreſſed in the ſame words, excepting this immaterial difference, "the *realm* of England," inſtead of *kingdom*, &c. A third time it is expreſſed thus,—"within this realm of England, and the places *aforeſaid*." So that even Ireland is not included. Now, can it reaſonably be ſuppoſed, that ſuch terms of limitation would have been ſo often uſed, or even once, in ſaid act, if there had then been the leaſt thought of the eſtabliſhment's taking place in the colonies, whether by virtue of this, or any preceding ſtatutes? Nay, is it not highly probable, that theſe limitative clauſes were thus repeatedly inſerted, on purpoſe to preclude all pretenſions that the ſtatutes of ED. and ELIZ. ſhould be ſo conſtrued as to extend the eſtabliſhment to the colonies, on account of any general expreſſions in them; ſuch as *all the dominions* of England, or the like? To me it appears, that this was at leaſt in part the real deſign of them; as if it had been ſaid. But altho' the ſaid ſtatutes are

now

now confirmed; yet this is to be underſtood *only* with regard to England, Wales and Berwick: Nor are they to be interpreted as touching or affecting the colonies, or any other of the Britiſh dominions, any general expreſſions in them notwithſtanding.

It being then ſuppoſed for the preſent, tho' not affirmed, that we have hitherto found no eſtabliſhment of the church of England in the colonies; let it be obſerved,

4. That the ſtatute of the 5th of Q. ANNE, ch. 5. which is next alledged, makes no *new* eſtabliſhment, nor *enlarges* the old. It is intitled, "An act for *ſecuring* the church of England *as by law eſtabliſhed.*"—By this act, all future Kings and Queens are to ſwear at their coronation, to preſerve the ſaid church as already eſtabliſhed. How far that eſtabliſhment actually extended, is to be learnt from the ſtatutes before in being. Indeed this act ſays, the King or Queen ſhall ſwear to *preſerve* the church of England "within the "kingdoms of England and Ireland, the dominion "of Wales, and town of Berwick upon Tweed, *and* "*the territories thereunto belonging:*" But, I am told by them that know much more of theſe matters than I can pretend to, that thoſe words, *the territories thereunto belonging*, as thus introduced, do not properly include the remote plantations in America.† But if they do, which may be conſidered as doubtful *at leaſt*, I beg leave to make a ſhort remark or two, upon that

† I ſuppoſe that the word *territories* here, is to be taken in connection *only* with the Town of *Berwick* upon Tweed, immediately preceding. The deſign hereof was probably to ſecure certain territories near *Berwick*, (which had been the ſubject of frequent diſpute, and ſometimes call'd *debated land*) within the Engliſh eſtabliſhment, in oppoſition to the Scotch and the kirk. "A Scotch-"man, who lately wrote a treatiſe of this country, mentions *that* "frequently called in our hiſtory, the *debatable land*, becauſe it "was under debate for ſeveral reigns, as *claim'd by both nations*, "till it became at length the inheritance of the King of England. "He ſays, it was a tract of forty miles in length, and ſix in "breadth, between *Berwick* and *Carliſle*, on the frontiers of both "kingdoms, whoſe inhabitants before the union," &c. *Comp. Syſt. of Geog.* By E. Bowen, Geog. to his Majeſty, Vol. I. p. 204. —It ſhould be remember'd, that the act in which this word *territories* is uſed as aforeſaid, was before the *Union*, tho' the ſame year.

ſuppoſition. Tho' the King were obliged to ſwear, even in expreſs terms, to *preſerve* the church of England in the colonies as the ſaid church was already eſtabliſhed; yet ſuch an *oath* would not *make* an eſtabliſhment in the plantations, if there were none before by virtue of preceding ſtatutes. This would leave the eſtabliſhment juſt as it was, of no greater extent. But if it ſhould be ſaid, that upon this ſuppoſition of the colonies being expreſly mentioned in the oath, it would be a trifling, inſignificant one, ſo far as it had reſpect to the colonies, unleſs it were taken for granted that the ſaid church was actually eſtabliſhed in them; I anſwer, No. For a King of Great Britain may well be ſuppoſed to have power to protect and defend the church of England as by law eſtabliſhed, even in thoſe parts of his dominions where it is not the eſtabliſhed religion, if any ſuch there were. The King would, by exerting his authority to defend his epiſcopalian ſubjects againſt all oppreſſions and grievances in the colonies, and by granting them all legal encouragements, act in conformity to ſuch an oath; and ſo as to render it far from an inſignificant one, tho' the church of England were not formally eſtabliſh'd in the colonies. This would doubtleſs be, preſerving the church of England in them, as by law eſtabliſh'd; i. e. in England. Theſe things are ſaid, only on ſuppoſition that thoſe words, *the territories*, &c. neceſſarily include the colonies: If they do not, there is no occaſion for theſe remarks: But even the former ſuppoſition is, I conceive, eaſily reconciled with that of the ſaid church's not being then actually eſtabliſhed in the colonies, or thought to be ſo.

5. As to the act of *Union*, which recites at large the preceding act, and makes it an eſſential and fundamental part of the Union; the learned Mr. J. F. does not pretend that it makes the leaſt *alteration* in the eſtabliſhment, or *enlarges* it. So that if the preceding ſtatutes did not bring the colonies within the eſtabliſhment, they remain without or beyond it, notwithſtanding this. The queſtion muſt therefore be decided, not by this, but thoſe.—Indeed my *Examiner* truly cites Dr. *Douglas* as aſſerting in expreſs terms, that,

that, by this act of union, "the church of England "government in all the Engliſh *colonies* was forever "eſtabliſhed." But this, it muſt be obſerved, is only the Dr.'s comment upon the text: There is no ſuch expreſſion in the act itſelf.

6. It is humbly conceived, there is one very peculiar reaſon, before alluded to, why the religious eſtabliſhment ſhould not be ſuppoſed to extend to the N. England colonies. Almoſt all the people by whom they were planted, were *Puritans*, and either actual nonconformiſts to the church of England, or very uneaſy under it at home. And it is a fact known to almoſt every body, I ſuppoſe, except my learned *Examiner*, that they came hither *chiefly* on a religious account:—that they might enjoy intire liberty of conſcience, free from thoſe reſtraints and embarraſments, not to ſay perſecutions, which they ſuffered there. Theſe things were alſo well known by the government, at the time of their emigration; and they were countenanced, at leaſt indulged thereby, in the proſecution of their deſign; having repeatedly received letters patent and charters from the crown, in order to facilitate their enterprize. If they had imagined, that they ſhould bring the religious eſtabliſhment here with them, and ſtill remain under the burden and grievances of it *in ſpite of their teeth*; they would, without doubt, have choſen rather to ſuffer theſe embarraſments at home, in their native and pleaſant land, than to have them to ſtruggle with in a foreign country, in conjunction with ſo many other difficulties attending ſuch an enterprize. Nor is it at all improbable, that theſe Britiſh colonies would not now have had a being, had not thoſe worthy adventurers taken it for granted, that by flying into a diſtant country, full of rocks, woods and barbarians, they ſhould get rid of an eſtabliſhment which they accounted much more grievous and inſupportable—I do not ſay this argument is concluſive; ſince it is *poſſible*, that they might be miſtaken in this reſpect. But it is, I humbly conceive, an argument worthy of ſome conſideration.

7. An-

7. Another probable reaſon that the church of England is not here eſtabliſhed, is this: Our *brethren* of that communion, ſince *brought in*, were, long after our preſent charter, obliged by the laws of this province (allowed by the crown) to pay *taxes* towards the ſupport of the ſettled miniſters here, not of their own denomination. In 1742 they were, as I conceive, with very good reaſon, by a perpetual law of this government, exempted therefrom. Whatever they were taxed for the ſupport of God's public worſhip, was thenceforward to be paid to the epiſcopal miniſters, on whoſe adminiſtrations they reſpectively attended. This act of exemption may be ſeen in our Province Law-book, An. Geo. II. dec. ſex. c. 8. Now, can it be ſuppoſed, that if the church of England had been eſtabliſhed here, a grievance of this nature would have been ſo long borne? Would not the epiſcopalians, or could they not eaſily, by proper repreſentations at home, have got a ſpeedy redreſs? Nay, is it not highly probable, that the government here would have been ſeverely reprimanded for ſuch an impoſition upon the members of the church here eſtabliſhed, as to oblige them to pay taxes to our *un-orthodox*, *non-eſtabliſhed*, *ſchiſmatical* miniſters? How juſtly, and how highly would this, in all probability, have been reſented by the crown? And yet, who ever heard that it was *thus* reſented; or that the government was reprimanded, as having taken it upon them to do what they had no *legal* right to do? I have been informed, whether rightly or not, that his Excellency then in the chair, when the aforeſaid act of exemption was paſſed, received the thanks of the then biſhop of London for his ſervice therein; as having contributed his endeavours to relieve the members of the church of England from an *inconvenience* or *hardſhip*, not from an *illegal* oppreſſion, which they had long labor'd under; as this moſt certainly would have been, had the church of England been the religion eſtabliſhed here by act of parliament. This naturally leads me to mention another reaſon why I cannot think the church of England

land eſtabliſhed here, in that excluſive ſenſe intended by the *Examiner* and *Letter-writer*; namely,

8. That to me it is evident that the modes of worſhip and diſcipline more generally profeſſed and practiſed in this government, have ſuch a firm and legal eſtabliſhment as is inconſiſtent with ſuch a ſuppoſition; I do not mean, with that of the church of England being in *any* ſenſe eſtabliſhed here, but that of its being eſtabliſhed excluſively of other proteſtant churches; or ſo as to be, by way of diſtinction and preheminence, *the eſtabliſhed religion of this country*. For if other communions, or chriſtian ſocieties, are alſo founded, encouraged and eſtabliſhed here by good and lawful authority; it ſeems impoſſible that the church of England can legally claim any ſuch preheminence as is contended for. But the proof of the aſſumption ſhall be the buſineſs of the next Section. In the mean time, I ſhall humbly refer it to the deciſion of others, whether enough has not been ſaid under the foregoing obſervations, to make it appear *at leaſt* doubtful, whether the church of England is eſtabliſhed in the colonies by the ſtatutes.

But tho' the ſaid church ſhould not be eſtabliſhed here, poſſibly the ſubſcription and oaths of the epiſcopal clergy, taken in England, may bind them in the colonies, or wherever they are. The *Letter-writer*, however, by taking great pains to ſhew, that the church of England is actually eſtabliſh'd here, as a *medium* to prove that the ſaid clergy are obliged by their oaths and ſubſcriptions even in the colonies, ſeems to concede, that no ſuch obligation lies upon them when they are got beyond the limits of the eſtabliſhment. For if it continues *beyond* the eſtabliſhment, what occaſion was there, in order to ſhew the obligation lying on the epiſcopal clergy here, to prove that the eſtabliſhment actually takes place here?—But with the queſtion about theſe oaths and ſubſcriptions,—where, and how far they are binding, I am not particularly concerned; tho' to determine this point, was the *Letter-writer*'s chief object.—How often ſoever the

Book

Book of *common prayer*, and adminiſtration of the ſacraments, &c. have been re-eſtabliſhed after a reviſe, alterations and amendments, or the ſaid oaths and ſubſcriptions enjoined, and the ſtatutes of EDWARD and ELIZ. confirmed; yet, it is humbly conceived, all this is far from amounting to an eſtabliſhment of the church of England in the colonies. And tho' the learned *Letter-writer* lays great ſtreſs on the *act of uniformity*; yet, upon his ſuppoſition, I believe he would find it very difficult at leaſt to aſſign even a tolerable reaſon why England, Wales and Berwick are again and again expreſly mentioned therein, in the manner they are; as if it was with a formal deſign to bound and limit the eſtabliſhment, notwithſtanding the general term *dominions* uſed in preceding ſtatutes, before theſe colonies had an exiſtence. †

SEC-

† *N. B.* Tho' it was conceded in the former part of this ſection, that Engliſh ſubjects ſpreading abroad into colonies, carry the *common law* with them; yet even this admits of *exceptions*. One example may ſuffice. *Slavery* is contrary to common law in England; there can be no ſlave there. But the buying and ſelling ſlaves is a univerſal, legal and allowed practice in the colonies. This was declared legal in the caſe of SMITH ver. BROWNE and COOPER; which is in part as follows. "The plaintiff declared in an *Indebitatus aſſumpſit*, for 20 *l.* for a *Negro* ſold by the plaintiff to the defendant, *viz.* in *Parocha beatæ Mariæ de Arcubus*——and verdict for the plaintiff; and on motion in arreſt of judgment, HOLT Ch. J. held, That as ſoon as a *Negro* comes into England, he becomes *free*.——HOLT Ch. J. ſaid, You ſhould have averred in the declaration, that the ſale was in *Virginia*, and *by the laws of that country* Negroes *are ſaleable*; for the laws of England *do not extend to Virginia*——Therefore he directed, the plaintiff ſhould amend, and the declaration ſhould be made, That the defendant was indebted to the plaintiff for a ſlave *ſold here in London*, but that the ſaid *Negro at the time of ſale was in Virginia*, and *that Negroes by the laws and ſtatutes of Virginia are ſaleable as chattels*."—— 2d SALK.

It is certain, none of the American colonies have thought themſelves bound by the common law, in this reſpect: and the government at home countenances them in making laws relative to *ſlaves*, contrary to common law in England, where liberty is ſo carefully guarded. Much more, then, may it be ſuppoſed, that the *ſtatutes* do not univerſally bind Engliſh ſubjects, emigrating into colonies; particularly thoſe ſtatutes, by which the church of England is eſta-

SECTION VI.

Of what the Examiner *ſays of the* non-eſtabliſhment *of any Church or Churches here, except that of England.*

THIS point he labors from p. 27 to 33. He infers from ſome addreſſes of thanks ſent from the miniſters of New-England to K. JAMES II. "for a *toleration* of religion," that our churches had no legal eſtabliſhment till the act of toleration took place, if at all. (See p. 27.) Upon which let it be briefly obſerved (1.) That arbitrary Kings are often thanked, even for not acting contrary to law and juſtice, or for permitting their ſubjects quietly to enjoy their lawful rights and privileges. (2.) He has not quoted theſe addreſſes of thanks, which I never ſaw. Nor does it appear from what he ſays, but that they might have reſpected the indulgencies granted to nonconformiſts in England, rather than any granted to the colonies. (3.) How much ſoever theſe worthy miniſters might be

eſtabliſhed. And, as has been before hinted, there are ſome ſpecial reaſons to think, they neither are, nor ever were obligatory, or ſuppoſed to be ſo, on the people of New-England:---The principles and views of our forefathers at the time of their emigration; the countenance and indulgence ſhewn them by the government, even in thoſe not very indulgent times:---the letters patent and charters repeatedly granted them, with an ample legiſlative authority, particularly a power to make laws relative to *religion*;---the laws actually made in conſequence hereof from time to time;---in one of which, expreſs mention is made of "divine worſhip in "the manner ESTABLISHED by the laws of this province:"---no declaration or intimation from the government at home, (tho' theſe things were known) that the church of England was eſtabliſhed here;---but on the contrary, thoſe very laws allowed by the King, whoſe *ſupremacy* in eccleſiaſtical affairs is ſaid to take place here:---and the clear conceſſion of the Lords Juſtices, after conſulting the Attorney and Solicitor General, that the national church was not eſtabliſhed here, in their letter to the Hon. Mr. DUMMER, 1725, of which more in the next ſection.

be miſtaken in their *politics*, this does not immediately affect the merits of the cauſe. Our New-England churches were neither the more nor the leſs eſtabliſhed for what they did: Nor is any one obliged to abide by their judgment, tho' it were certain they ſuppoſed theſe churches were not then eſtabliſhed; as I never aſſerted they were. (4.) It is ſufficient to my purpoſe, if they have had a proper eſtabliſhment ſince the revolution, and the charter of WILLIAM and MARY. The preſent remarks ſhall therefore relate to that charter, and to laws ſubſequent thereto.

But my *candid Examiner*, being perhaps aware that theſe laws are directly againſt his poſitions, ſeems deſirous of removing them out of his way in the firſt place. This he does by repreſenting them as mere nullities, or next to nullities. He makes a jeſt of thoſe laws, ſome of which I referred to, in order to ſhew that our miniſters and churches were by no means deſtitute of the ſupport and encouragement of law;—laws that had "received the royal ſanction." How modeſtly and judiciouſly he *ſneers* at this! (p. 26.) "I believe," ſays he, "if the Dr. held an eſtate upon "a title ſo *precarious*, as that of its being *merely over-*"*look'd*," [Quere, what *over-look'd?*—the *eſtate?*—the *title?*—or what?] "he would be ſolicitous *of* ob-"taining a better confirmation of it." And again, p. 31. "What becomes of his argument for a civil or "legal eſtabliſhment, founded on certain acts of aſ-"ſembly, *not formally ſet aſide*, and therefore *ſuppoſed* "to be confirmed by royal ſanction?"—So that, it ſeems, I muſt firſt defend our *laws* themſelves againſt his bold attacks, before I defend our *churches* by them. This is manifeſtly ſtriking at our laws in general; ſince they in general ſtand upon the very ſame footing with thoſe relative to religion; it being a very rare thing, that any of them are approved of by the crown in a more *explicit* manner than thoſe, to which he refers. I hardly know whether one may preſume ſo far upon the *candor* of this gentleman, as to ſuppoſe that he allows the legality and validity of our charter itſelf.

ſelf. But taking it for granted that he does ſo, till he ſhall think proper to *expoſe* himſelf by denying it, as he has done by inſulting our laws; I would briefly remind him of two or three things.

1. That our laws, being ſent home for the King's approbation, if not expreſly *diſallowed* and *rejected*, under his ſign manual and ſignet, within three years after, are good to all intents and purpoſes, according to the charter. "*Provided always*," ſays the charter, "That in caſe we, our heirs or ſucceſſors, *ſhall not*, "within the term of three years after the preſenting "ſuch orders, laws, ſtatutes or ordinances, as afore-"ſaid, ſignify our or their *diſallowance* of the ſame, "then the ſaid orders, laws, &c. ſhall be and con-"tinue in *full force and effect*, according to the true "intent and meaning of the ſame."—

2. Except in ſome extraordinary caſes, our laws are never allowed or ratified by the crown, in any other manner than that, which is here poſitively declared ſufficient to render them of *full force and effect*. And the *Examiner*, it is probable, would be very glad of a good eſtate, upon a title as *precarious* as this (in his own language) "of being merely *over-looked*;" and would be little "ſolicitous of obtaining a better." —Indeed a better cannot be had, at leaſt not in the colonies.

3. Beſides a very *general* and *ample* legiſlative power granted in the charter, with this ſingle limitation, that our laws ſhall not be "repugnant or contrary" to thoſe of England: Beſides this general power, I ſay, the charter expreſly gives a power to make laws relative to *religion*, in the following words—"To diſ-"poſe of matters and things whereby our ſubjects, "inhabitants of ſaid province, may be *religiouſly*, "peaceably and civilly governed."—Here, by the way, I have done what the *Examiner* calls upon me to do, with ſuch a gentleman-like air of triumph. Blaming me with reference to the rule which I laid down for interpreting the *Society*'s charter, he ſays; "Let "us now apply this rule to the charter granted to the "Maſſa-

" Maſſachuſetts Bay. Nothing can be ſuppoſed the " object, or any part of the object of this conſtitution, " but what *plainly appears* to be ſo, from the *very* " *words* of their charter, which very words muſt de- " termine and limit the ſenſe of the Grantor. It was " only for thoſe purpoſes that are particularly ex- " preſſed.—Let the Dr. now read and examine the " preſent colony charter—and point out to us the paſ- " ſage or paſſages, where in expreſs words a power is " granted," &c. p. 32. I anſwer, the general legiſlative power granted, with the ſingle exception aforeſaid, even without that other clauſe, " whereby our " ſubjects—may be *religiouſly*—governed," includes a power to make *ſuch* a religious eſtabliſhment as I intended. But this latter clauſe being conſidered in connexion therewith, puts the matter beyond diſpute. For it *plainly appears from the very words of the charter*, that the legiſlative body here have a power to make laws and conſtitutions relative to religion; not being *contrary* or *repugnant* to the laws of England, as ours are not; ſince they leave the members of the church of England at full liberty to worſhip God according to their conſciences; and even ſupport and encourage them therein, as will hereafter appear.

Theſe things being premiſed, I proceed to remind the *Examiner*, and others who may be as much ſtrangers to our laws as he appears to be, of ſome acts of aſſembly relative to the eſtabliſhment, not of a *provincial church*, (which I never ſuppoſed) but of *proteſtant churches* of various denominations; or rather, of any or all denominations that have been, or ſhall be ſet up among us; in conformity to the language and ſpirit of the charter:—" And for the greater *eaſe* and *encou-* " *ragement* of our loving ſubjects inhabiting our ſaid " province,—and of ſuch as ſhall come to inhabit " there, we do—ordain, that forever hereafter there " ſhall be a liberty of conſcience allowed in the worſhip " of God to *all chriſtians* (except papiſts) inhabiting, " or which ſhall inhabit," &c.

In

In my *Obſervations* I particularly reminded the reader of, and partly cited, the *act for the ſettlement and ſupport of miniſters*, An. R. Gul. et Ma. quart. the next year after the charter. By this it is ordained, that all towns ſhall be provided with *able*, *learned* and *orthodox* miniſters; and particular care is taken for their ſupport, &c. According to which act, compared with what the charter ſays of *liberty of conſcience*, to all chriſtians except *Papiſts*, I conceive, proteſtants of all denominations are conſidered by the *government* here, as *orthodox*. So that if any particular town in the Province ſhould legally chuſe, ſettle and ſupport a proteſtant miniſter of *any* denomination, whether epiſcopalian, preſbyterian, congregational, baptiſt, or lutheran, this would be looked upon as ſatisfying the ſaid law. I have divers reaſons for this ſuppoſition. At preſent one ſhall ſuffice, drawn from a paragraph of this ſame act; in which it is ſaid, That the *reſpective churches* within this province, ſhall "at all times here-"after, uſe, exerciſe and enjoy all their privileges "and freedoms reſpecting divine worſhip, church-"order and diſcipline: And ſhall be *encouraged* in "the peaceable and regular profeſſion and practice "thereof." †

In another act of the 4th and 5th of Wm. and Mary, the manner in which miniſters are to be choſen, recognized as ſuch, and ſupported; with ſome

† If any ſhould think it an inconſiſtent ſuppoſition, that ſeveral diſtinct churches, of various denominations, and differing very conſiderably from each other, ſhould, in my ſenſe, be eſtabliſhed in the ſame province, and reſpectively protected and encouraged by the ſame legiſlature; the anſwer is ſhort and eaſy, *viz.* That this is not in any degree more incongruous or inconſiſtent, than that the two different churches of England and Scotland, reſpectively eſtabliſhed long before the *Union* ſhou'd *continue* ſo after it, and be *equally* the eſtabliſhed churches of one kingdom, Great Britain; defended and encouraged by the ſame king and parliament: Which all know to be facts. And this eſtabliſhment, or rather theſe eſtabliſhments, are reſpectively declared in the act of *Union*, *eſſential* articles and conditions of it.—An hundred churches, all of different denominations, if there were ſo many, might all be eſtabliſhed in the ſame kingdom or colony, as well as one, two or three.

reſerves as to the town of Boſton, is preſcribed; and whoever reads ſaid act, intitled, *An Act for repealing and altering of ſome clauſes*, &c. will ſee that it has a ſpecial reference to the more uſual practice and cuſtoms of our *congregational* churches from the beginning. See alſo another act to this purpoſe, GULIEL. 7mo. ch. 9.

By an act in the 1ſt of Q. ANNE, ch. 3d, intitled, *An act for the more effectual providing for the ſupport of miniſters*, certain methods of evading the preceding laws, practiſed by "*irreligious perſons*, averſe and "oppoſite to the *public worſhip of God*," are particularly guarded againſt.

By the foregoing acts it appears, that notwithſtanding the general liberty of conſcience allowed here, the government had a ſpecial regard to our congregational method of worſhip and diſcipline. This appears ſtill more evident from an act to which I referred in the preceding ſection, for exempting the profeſſed members of the church of England from paying to the ſupport of our miniſters; An. GEO. II. 16to. ch. 8vo. Part of the preamble of which, is in theſe words: "Whereas the profeſſed members of the *church of* "*England* have complained that they are unreaſon- "ably taxed for the ſupport of divine worſhip *in the* "*manner* ESTABLISHED *by the laws of this Province*," &c. The legiſlature here *ſuppoſed*, then, at leaſt, that there was ſome particular *manner of worſhip* ESTABLISHED here, by way of eminence, or in preference to all others, particularly to that of the church of England. And what that was, if any ſuch there were, is ſufficiently evident from the laws foregoing, compared with the moſt *general*, known principles and practices of the inhabitants of this country, from the firſt ſettlement of it. It ſhould be farther remembered, however, that by this very act the members and miniſters of the church of England are countenanced and encouraged: ſince it makes a legal proviſion for their maintaining the public worſhip of God in *their own way*. It ſays expreſly, "The treaſurer

"of

" of ſuch town, &c. ſhall deliver the taxes collected " of every profeſſed member of the church of Eng- " land unto the miniſter of the *ſaid church*, with " whom he uſually and frequently attends the public " worſhip of God—which miniſter ſhall have power " to receive, and if need be, *to* RECOVER *the ſame in* " *law*, to *ſupport* him in the place whereunto he is " duly deſigned and ſent."

The laſt act to which I ſhall refer on this occaſion, is one of the 28th of GEO. II. ch. 3d. intitled, *An act for ſecuring and rendering more effectual grants and donations to pious and charitable uſes, and for the better ſupport and maintenance of* MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL, &c. My view herein is more eſpecially to ſhew two things: *Firſt*, that there is a real and effectual eſtabliſhment of religion made by the laws of this province; and *ſecondly*, That it is, perhaps, the moſt generous and catholic one that was ever made in any country; ſince, tho' it more eſpecially regards proteſtant churches of *one denomination*, yet it countenances and encourages *all* others, and puts them in a legal method to ſupport the public worſhip of God, according to their inclinations and conſciences reſpectively. By this it is enacted, " That the deacons of " *all* the ſeveral proteſtant churches, not being epiſ- " copal churches, AND the church wardens of the ſe- " veral epiſcopal churches, are and ſhall be deemed " ſo far *bodies corporate*, as to take in ſucceſſion all " grants and donations—made either to their *ſeveral* " churches, the poor of their churches, or to them " and their ſucceſſors, and to *ſue* and *defend* in all " actions touching the ſame."—It is afterwards ordained in this act, That whereas the *ſeveral congregations* in the town of Boſton, and ſome others, are not by law enabled by vote to raiſe money " for the *ſup-* " *port* of the miniſtry and public worſhip among " them;" the proprietors of pews, deacons or church wardens may, after taking certain ſteps, " cauſe the " ſeveral pews in ſuch houſes to be valued—and a " new eſtimate to be put upon ſaid pews from time

" to time—and a tax to be laid upon each pew—the " money ſo raiſed to be applied towards the *ſupport* " *of the miniſtry*," &c.

If my *Examiner* will be pleaſed to conſider theſe ſeveral acts, and the ſolid foundation on which they reſt in our charter, by virtue of the royal allowance; he may perhaps be convinced, that our N. England, congregational churches, not only *ſeem* to have a proper, legal eſtabliſhment, as I cautiouſly expreſſed it before; but have it in *reality*. And as I would hope he is not paſt *bluſhing*, I ſhall juſt remind him of his own words on this occaſion, which may poſſibly put him upon it. " Indeed he is ſo *modeſt*," ſays he, " as " only to aſſert that they *ſeem* to have a legal eſta- " bliſhment, but ſince HE KNEW that this was no " eſtabliſhment AT ALL, it was perhaps not quite *in-* " *genuous* to tell his readers, that it *ſeemed* to be one."

But the very *candid* gentleman lays great ſtreſs on a certain Letter from their Excellencies the Lords Juſtices, in 1725, to the Hon. W. DUMMER, Eſq; at that time commander in chief of this province, relative to the calling a *ſynod*, which was then talk'd of and propoſed here. In this it is ſaid, among other things, that " this matter doth highly concern his " Majeſty's royal *prerogative*." It follows, " Their " Excellencies refer'd the conſideration of it to Mr. " Attorney and Mr. Solicitor General, who—re- " ported, That from the charter and laws of your " colony, they cannot collect that there is any regu- " lar eſtabliſhment of A NATIONAL OR PROVINCIAL " CHURCH there, *ſo as to warrant the holding of con-* " *vocations or ſynods of the clergy*; but if ſuch ſynods " *might* be holden, yet they take it to be clear in point " of law, that his Majeſty's *ſupremacy* in eccleſiaſtical " affairs, being a branch of his *prerogative*, does take " place in the plantations, and that *ſynods* cannot be " held——without authority from his Majeſty," &c. This, in the *Examiner*'s opinion, is an undeniable confutation of what I had ſaid in the *Obſervations*. On the contrary, I am of opinion that it is ſo far from militating,

militating, in the *leaſt degree*, with any thing by me advanced, that it will ſerve greatly to confirm it all.

Let me make a few remarks. And,

1. I never ſaid, or thought, that there was any *national* or *provincial* CHURCH eſtabliſhed here; but only a number of particular CHURCHES of different denominations.

2. Much leſs did I aſſert, there was any national or provincial CHURCH eſtabliſh'd *in ſuch a manner* as to warrant the holding of *convocations* or *ſynods*. Which is what their Excellencies deny, or rather heſitate concerning; plainly conceding that there was, nevertheleſs, *ſome ſort* of religious eſtabliſhment here, by our laws.

3. Tho' I had aſſerted both theſe things, yet I did not ſay, that *Synods* might be held here, "without [ſpecial] authority from his Majeſty:" Which their Lordſhips diſallow; the calling of theſe being, according to the Britiſh conſtitution, one of the *jura regalia*, or ſpecial unalienable prerogatives of the Sovereign; whoſe *ſupremacy* in eccleſiaſtical affairs is ſaid to take place in all his dominions.

4. Merely this conſideration, that convocations and ſynods cannot be aſſembled without expreſs authority from the King, no more proves that there is here no eſtabliſh'd *provincial* CHURCH, than it proves that there is no *national* ONE in England: For neither can convocations or ſynods be held there, without ſuch authority from his Majeſty; as *ſome* people know to their *ſorrow*.—All this is perfectly conſiſtent with whatever I ſaid, relating to the legal footing on which our churches ſtand, as *diſtinct* chriſtian ſocieties; not as one *collective* body, like the church of England.

5. From this letter a very probable argument may be drawn, that the national church of England is not, and never was ſuppoſed to be eſtabliſhed here, by the ſtatutes. For if it had been ſo, muſt not their Excellencies, and the Attorney and Solicitor General have known it? And if they had known it, would they not have made ſhort work in their letter as to ſynods, by

ſaying ſo? Would they have gone into a particular examination of our charter and laws; and ſaid, that from *theſe* they could not collect that there was any *national* or *provincial church* eſtabliſh'd here, *ſo as to warrant*, &c.? Is not this a plain conceſſion, that they found there was ſome kind of *legal* eſtabliſhment here, tho' not of any national or provincial CHURCH, *ſo as to warrant*, &c.? Is this the language that might have been expected from thoſe ſages in the law, if it had once entered into their thoughts, that the national church of England was here eſtabliſh'd? The *Examiner* was aware of this objection; and endeavour'd to obviate it. I will not expoſe him ſo much, as to ſhew particularly in what way. The reader may ſee, *Cand. Ex.* p. 38.

6. As on one hand it may be fairly collected from this letter, that the church of England is not eſtabliſh'd here, in the *Examiner*'s ſenſe; ſo, on the other hand, a good argument may be drawn from it for the *validity* of thoſe laws, by which different proteſtant churches are here eſtabliſhed; particularly congregational ones, in conformity to the ſenſe intended and explained by me. For in this letter it is ſpoken of as a clear point, that the King's eccleſiaſtical *ſupremacy*, "being a branch of his *prerogative*, does take place "in the plantations." And are not all the laws aforeſaid, allowed and ratified by the King, who is alſo head of the church of England? Is not the denial of their *validity*, implicitly ſtriking at the King's *ſupremacy* in eccleſiaſtical affairs? How free do theſe epiſcopalians, who ſcoff at the legal eſtabliſhment of religion here, make with his Majeſty's royal prerogative? What unbecoming liberties do they take with the auguſt viſible head of their own church; who is pleaſed, by his authority, to countenance and ſupport, to confirm and encourage ours?

From hence it appears, that I have as little *occaſion* as I have inclination, "to diſpute this point with the "Lords Juſtices, and prove that the Attorney and "Solicitor General did not underſtand the colony "charter;"

" charter;" which this penetrating as well as *candid* and well-bred gentleman ſuggeſts, I have at leaſt much *occaſion*, if not a ſtrong deſire to do. Let the reader ſee how he triumphs with reſpect to this matter, p. 31. Let the *Examiner* alſo review that page himſelf: I am not of ſuch a vindictive ſpirit as to deſire any ſeverer revenge on him, than this muſt be to a perſon of the leaſt ſenſibility or modeſty.

I might perhaps expreſs myſelf incautiouſly in the *Obſervations*, by ſaying in general, without explaining myſelf, that the church of England was not eſtabliſh'd here. My meaning was, that it was not eſtabliſh'd here by the laws of England. It has undoubtedly the ſupport and encouragement of our provincial laws, as other proteſtant churches have: But I ſuppoſe the *Examiner*, and ſome perſons of the ſame turn of mind, will take this conceſſion in great dudgeon; thinking themſelves even degraded and injured, by not being exalted quite ſo high *above* their brethren, as they ſeem to be for exalting themſelves.—But notwithſtanding what has been ſaid, tho' I really believe, yet I do not abſolutely affirm, that the church of England is not eſtabliſh'd here by act of parliament. Be that as it may, yet that it is not eſtabliſh'd in the manner intended by them, ſo as to render all the provincial laws reſpecting our churches mere nullities, is very certain.

Let me juſt remark farther here, That tho' all I have ſaid relative to eſtabliſhments, ſhould be indefenſible, yet this would not very materially affect the main argument of the *Obſervations* reſpecting the *Society*. For if God's word, worſhip and ſacraments are *actually* adminiſtred and upheld here, ſo that the King's loving ſubjects are in no particular or imminent danger of falling into atheiſm and infidelity, or being perverted to popery; it is plain, theſe parts are not the proper object of the *Society*'s care and expence, according to their charter, whether there is any *legal* eſtabliſhment of religion here or not. And what has been ſaid upon this ſubject, is in general ap-

plicable to Connecticut and New-Hampſhire governments; tho' ſaid with particular reference to this province.*

* The author would here take occaſion to expreſs his hearty ſorrow, that he underſtands certain people in ſome other colonies have taken great offence, that in his *Obſervations* he ſpoke of their religious advantages and improvements as much inferior to thoſe of the people in the three governments aboveſaid. He ſeriouſly declares that he had not the leaſt intention to inſult, revile and reproach them; but thought of them with chriſtian concern and affection. Nor was he a little ſurprized, when he firſt heard that this was ſo highly reſented. If he uſed any reproachful expreſſion, it was undeſigned; he is ſincerely ſorry for it. And if the perſons offended are *well advanced* in chriſtian *charity*, he hopes they will forgive him on this apology.

SECTION VII.

Of the Examiner's *exceptions againſt the account given in the* Obſervations, *of the ſtate of religion in New-England before and ſince the incorporation of the* Society.†

I DO not recollect any thing in the *Examination*, which directly or materially affects the merits of the cauſe, but what has been already conſidered. Whether he has done any thing hitherto, ſufficient to put

† Immediately preceding this part of his labor, the *Examiner* ſpeaks, p. 44, 45, 46. of the Congregationaliſts uſing their endeavours to defeat the pious intention of three epiſcopal miſſions in the colony of Rhode Iſland, in places where there was then "no ſet-"tled miniſter of any denomination." This, I believe, is at beſt a miſtake. I am informed, that in two at leaſt of the three places which he mentions, (the other I never heard of before) there were congregational miniſters prior to the miſſionaries going thither; ſo that at preſent this appears to me to be a groundleſs, invidious accuſation; not to uſe his own language, *ſlander*. And can this obſcure anonymous writer, who produces no vouchers, expect to be credited in ſuch a caſe? Tho' he were not aſhamed to be known, and

put an end to my ſuppoſed *long triumph*, or ſo play'd the hero, as to lay a good foundation even for a *ſhort one* himſelf, our common readers are the propereſt judges. Has he diſproved a ſingle fact or circumſtance, alledged by me? Has he produced any witneſſes or authorities that overthrow, or even militate againſt thoſe which I brought? Has he ſhewn that I reaſon fallaciouſly or inconcluſively from any acknowledged facts? Has he made it appear that I put a wrong conſtruction on the charter? Has he been able, with all his efforts, to fix the charge of inconſiſtency upon me? If not, what has he hitherto done?—except venting his *candor* at me;—frequently triumphing without victory;—and contributing, by his method of treating the ſubject, to fix on the venerable *Society* a far more heinous charge than was brought by me; that of *wilfully* betraying their truſt.

He proceeds to find fault with my account of the ſtate of religion in New-England before and ſince the incorporation of the *Society*—"This account," ſays he, "in *many* things can by no means be approved," p. 46. But if it ſhall be made to appear, that he no where contradicts my account, without contradicting himſelf alſo, methinks I ſhall be intitled to a little more *candor* in this reſpect, than I have experienced in others. In the very next paragraph and words, he does in effect acknowledge the truth of my account in general. "It is not the author's intention," ſays he, "to call in queſtion the religious character of the "*firſt adventurers* to New-England; he doubts not in "the

and were a perſon of good reputation; yet it would hardly be modeſt in him to require our aſſent to ſuch improbable tales, on his bare word; at leaſt unleſs he declared theſe things, as of his own particular and certain knowledge. What then is it ſhort of high preſumption for a man, who chuſes to keep in the dark, to give out ſuch defamatory ſtories, in order to bring an odium upon the people of our profeſſion, with the hopes of being believed? Till ſome proof of theſe ſtories is produced, the author of them cannot blame us, if we conſider them as invented by himſelf, or at beſt taken up and publiſhed to the world, without any ſolid foundation. And if he ſhould be *ſharply rebuked* for ſuch a way of proceeding, he would have no juſt cauſe of complaint.

" the leaſt but that they were ſerious well-meaning " people, and although labouring under ſome miſ- " takes and prejudices, yet many of them perſons of " great wiſdom and underſtanding as well as piety. " Nor will it be diſputed, that they made early pro- " viſion for the public worſhip of God." In all this we ſeem perfectly agreed. He proceeds: " But how far " their coming hither was occaſioned by their ſuffer- " ings and *perſecutions* at home, as alſo what their " *ſentiments* were as to religious matters, may de- " ſerve further enquiry." Here there is an hint, tho' no direct aſſertion, that theſe were two of the *many things* in my account, which could not be approved. I am willing to attend him in this enquiry. But it ſeems, he was ſo full of *candor*, that he could not go on to correct my miſtakes, without firſt giving ſcope to it in a tragical exclamation and invective againſt me, as an impious heretic. The *candor* of this paragraph, p. 47, 48. ſhall have ſome notice taken of it hereafter. I am not ſo impatient under his *ſharp rebukes*, but that I can paſs them over for the preſent; and attend to what he ſays reſpecting the occaſion of our forefathers coming into New-England.

He ſays, p. 48. concerning " thoſe good men," that they " are ſuppoſed to have firſt come hither for " the ſake of enjoying a pure religion according to " their conſciences"—and juſt after he adds; " Yet " becauſe this *ſtale pretence* concerning the deſign of " the *firſt adventurers*, as to religious matters, is art- " fully and induſtriouſly propagated among the com- " mon people, who have not ſufficient opportunities " of examining this matter, it will be neceſſary to " give it a more particular conſideration." Here the reader will obſerve, he calls it a *ſtale pretence*, that the *firſt adventurers* hither came on ſuch an account as I had ſuppoſed; ſo that here he manifeſtly oppoſes me. But he immediately produces a quotation from Dr. Douglas, as if it were on purpoſe to confirm my account, and ſhew his own miſtake, in calling this a *ſtale pretence*. The Doctor, after ſpeaking of Robert

Brown's

BROWN's preaching againſt the ceremonies and diſcipline of the church of England, 1580, and his being "perſecuted or baited and teazed by the biſhops "courts," ſays, that "he with ſome of his diſciples "left England, and formed a church at Middlebo-"rough"—but, that he at laſt recanted, and died in the communion of the church of England. "A con-"gregation of theſe *Browniſts*," as the Dr. goes on, "was formed in Yarmouth, 1602; being harraſſed by "the eſtabliſhed church of England, with their paſ-"tor they tranſported themſelves to Leyden in Hol-"land; here they became more moderate under the "direction of their paſtor Mr. ROBINSON; and from "Browniſts changed their denomination to that of "Independents. Being of *unſteady temper*, they re-"ſolved to remove from among ſtrangers after ten "years reſidence, to ſome remote country in ſome "wilderneſs, where, without *moleſtation*, they might "worſhip God in their own devotional way." Theſe then were confeſſedly the *firſt adventurers* who became *ſettlers* in New-England. And whoever knows any thing of Dr. DOUGLAS's religious ſentiments, † will make conſiderable allowance for his calling the aforeſaid R. BROWN "a hot-headed young enthuſiaſtical "clergyman;" and thoſe whom he ſpeaks of as his diſciples, perſons of "unſteady temper," &c. They were doubtleſs in general very pious, good men. The Dr. himſelf allows, that they were "more moderate" before they came hither; and that their motive in coming hither was, in his peculiar turn of phraſe, that they might worſhip God *in their own devotional way*, without moleſtation. "Thus," to uſe the *Examiner*'s own words on this occaſion, "the *firſt* effectual ſettle-"ment in New-England was clearly made on a re-"ligious

† *Quere*, Upon what grounds, and with what view does this *candid* gentleman elſewhere ſpeak of Dr. *Douglas* as my "favou-"rite author?" Might he not with far better reaſon, and more truth, have called Biſhop *Tillotſon*, Biſhop *Butler*, or the late Biſhop of London Dr. *Sherlock*, my *favourite author?* But this, perhaps, would not ſo well have anſwered his *generous* and *candid* deſign with reſpect to me?

" ligious account," p. 49. This was at Plymouth, in 1620. And it really ſeems very *candid* in him thus to confirm my account of the matter, in direct contradiction to himſelf,—that this was a *ſtale pretence*; though he had in effect acknowledged the truth of it before.

The *Examiner* goes on: " But as to the *firſt* ſettlers " of the colony of the Maſſachuſetts-Bay, underſtood " as *poſterior* to, and diſtinct from that of Plymouth, " they plainly acted as other men uſually do upon like " occaſions, from hopes of encreaſing their *eſtates*, " and providing an ample inheritance for their chil- " dren."—And " as it was now pretty generally " known, that the Plymouth adventurers had ſet up " a way of worſhip different from the publick eſta- " bliſhment of the nation, it began to be ſuſpected " and reported, that this *new* company had a purpoſe " of the ſame nature, as ſoon as they ſhould arrive in " America. This came to the ears of governor WIN- " THROP and his aſſociates, while they lay wind- " bound at Yarmouth, and gave them great uneaſi- " neſs, *as well it might*, to lie under the *odium of this* " *ſlander*, and occaſioned their writing the following " letter for their own *exculpation* before they put to " ſea."—Part of the letter follows, p. 50, 51. in which they ſpeak very civilly and reſpectfully of the church of England as their *mother*, &c. &c.

All this is manifeſtly introduced in oppoſition to the account given by me, of the *firſt* ſettlers in New-England, and their motive in coming hither. This appears from the uſe the *Examiner* makes of it. For after producing Mr. PRINCE's teſtimony, that theſe pious people were profeſſed members of the church of England, *till they came into America*; he goes on thus: " From the foregoing letter and teſtimony it is evi- " dent, that whatever the caſe was as to other places, " and with regard to other adventurers, the *firſt* ſet- " tlers of the Maſſachuſetts-Bay at leaſt, thoſe pious " good men, who left *the fair cities, villages, and* " *delightful fields of Britain, for the then inhoſpitable*

" *ſhores*

" *ſhores and deſarts of America*, did not do it upon " *any diſguſt* they had taken at the eſtabliſhed religion " of their country; but from *quite other motives.*"—p. 51, 52. Let the reader alſo be pleaſed to ſee how the *Examiner* triumphs upon this occaſion, through the next page. But let me unravel this piece of ſophiſtry;—at leaſt, what would deſerve no other name, if it were not found in a *candid Examination.* And,

1. I obſerve, that G. WINTHROP and his aſſociates, whom he calls " the *firſt ſettlers* of the Maſſachu- " ſetts-Bay," came over in the year 1630, at leaſt ten years after the *firſt ſettlers* in Plymouth colony, who had by that time made a conſiderable eſtabliſhment.

2. That, according to his own account from Dr. DOUGLAS, theſe *firſt* Plymouth adventurers were *perſecuted*, *baited*, *teazed* and *harraſſed* in the biſhops courts; and did indiſputably come hither for conſcience ſake. In the *Examiner*'s own words, " Thus the " *firſt* effective ſettlement in New-England was clearly " made on a religious account." And he had before ſpoken of the *firſt adventurers* to New-England as perſons of a good religious character, " many of them " perſons of *great wiſdom* and *underſtanding* as well as " *piety*," p. 47. If he ſpoke ſincerely, and with propriety, he muſt have meant theſe Plymouth adventurers, by whom, he acknowledges, the *firſt* effective ſettlement was made in New-England.

3. From hence it appears, that he acknowledges my account to be juſt; though he would ſeem to contradict it, by the uſe of an equivocal term, *the Maſſachuſetts-Bay*. He knows that this now comprehends the old Plymouth colony, which was formerly diſtinct from it, and firſt ſettled. He alſo knows, that New-England, or *this Country*, comprehends both, and much more. So that when I ſpoke of the *firſt ſettlers* of New-England, or of this country, as perſecuted nonconformiſts, who came hither on a religious account, I ſaid no more than was literally true, even according to the authority cited by himſelf. And although

though I had any where ſaid, as I did not, that the *firſt ſettlers* of the Maſſachuſetts-Bay came over on ſuch an occaſion, might not a gentleman of *candor* have underſtood me as ſpeaking of the Maſſachuſetts-Bay, as it now includes Plymouth colony, not as it was formerly diſtinguiſhed from it? Did I aſſert, or intimate, that the *firſt* ſettlers of the Maſſachuſetts, in diſtinction from Plymouth, came on ſuch an account? No. What ground or occaſion was there then for the Examiner's alert demand, p. 52. ſpeaking of G. WINTHROP and the other ſigners of the letter aforeſaid?—"After ſuch an explicit declaration as this, "written and ſigned with their own hands, how can "the Dr. pretend, that *theſe men* were aggrieved at "home, that they *came hither chiefly on account of* "*their ſufferings for nonconformity, that they fled hi-*"*ther as to an aſſylum from epiſcopal perſecution?*"— If I had actually ſaid ſo, it would not have been ſo remote from truth as he imagines. But at preſent it is ſufficient to deny, that I gave ſuch an account of *theſe men*, who were *not* the *firſt* ſettlers of New-England, even according to his own. Though he was either not ſufficiently cautious of contradicting himſelf, or of impoſing on his readers, by the uſe of an equivocal term afterwards.

4. To me there appears a little fineſſe and double-dealing in what this *candid* gentleman ſays of the religious character of our forefathers, though I do not poſitively accuſe him as to this. I will lay ſome of the grounds of my ſuſpicion before the reader, in a few words. He ſpeaks very reſpectfully of the "firſt adventurers" to New-England, their wiſdom, piety, &c. p. 46, 47. Theſe were the Plymouth ſettlers; who had been harraſſed for nonconformity in England, before they went to Holland. But afterwards he ſpeaks in ſuch a manner, as can hardly be reconciled with the ſuppoſition that he really meant *them*; but rather only G. WINTHROP and his aſſociates, who, he ſuppoſes, were churchmen. For when he mentions the ſuſpicions in England, that theſe latter had

had a deſign to ſet up a way of worſhip here, as the Plymotheans had done, *different from the publick eſtabliſhment of the nation*, he ſays, "This gave them great "uneaſineſs, *as well it might*, to lie under the *odium* "of this *ſlander*;" to *exculpate* themſelves as to which, he ſays, they wrote the aforeſaid letter. *Quere*, Would he have expreſſed himſelf in this manner, if he had really ſuppoſed the Plymouth ſettlers, notwithſtanding their avowed ſeparation from the church of England, very pious and good men; "many of "them perſons of great wiſdom, &c.?" Again,—"The firſt ſettlers of the Maſſachuſetts Bay," [here plainly meaning G. WINTHROP and aſſociates, &c.] "at leaſt, thoſe *pious good men*, who left *the fair* "*cities*, &c.—did not do it from *any* diſguſt they had "taken at the eſtabliſh'd religion of their country." —Is this, or is it not a hint, that thoſe others who came hither before, profeſſedly on this account, are not to be reckon'd among the *pious good men?*— Again, ſpeaking of G. WINTHROP, &c. whom he ſuppoſes I had repreſented as nonconformiſts, antecedently to their coming hither, he ſays,—"Let "the Dr. conſider what recompence he can make to "the memory of *theſe men*, for *abuſing* them with the "*opprobrious* charge of *ſectariſm* and *hypocriſy*." Does it not plainly appear from hence, that to have ſaid theſe perſons were nonconformiſts, and came hither for conſcience ſake, would, in his opinion, have been to *abuſe* them, and to bring an *opprobrious* charge againſt them as *ſectaries* and *hypocrites? Quere* then, What opinion muſt he have of the Plymotheans, who certainly left England on account of their diſlike to the eſtabliſh'd church; however reſpectfully he may *ſeem* to ſpeak of them? *Quere* alſo, What opinion muſt he conſequently entertain of all us nonconformiſts to ſaid church, which he ſuppoſes to be eſtabliſh'd here?

Upon the whole, the intelligent reader will ſee, with how much propriety I might retort upon him his own words; "This gentleman has a very ſtrange "method of proving and diſproving, of aſſerting

"and

" and giving up again. Sure he could never expect " to arrive at any ſolid concluſion, by this *wanton* me- " thod of reaſoning."

SECTION VIII.

That the Examiner *has much miſtaken the religious principles, character and views of the firſt Set- tlers of the* Maſſachuſetts-Bay, *as diſtinguiſhed from* Plymouth colony.

IN the preceding ſection I vindicated my account of the *firſt* ſettlers of New-England, and ſhewed how this *candid* gentleman, rather than not contradict me, contradicts himſelf: So that the *many things* which, as he ſaid, could by no means be approved in my account, really come to *nothing*, by his own conceſſions. I had, in the *Obſervations*, ſaid nothing of the *firſt* ſettlers of the Maſſachuſetts, in diſtinction from Plymouth: But this gentleman having thought proper to ſpeak particularly of them, it may not be unacceptable to the reader, if I correct his miſtakes relative to them, by giving a brief account of *this* ſettlement, and the principles and motives of the ſettlers. This account ſhall be partly taken from Dr. C. MATHER's *Magnalia Ch. Amer.* or Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of New-England; and partly from more ancient, and the moſt authentic records.

And that this ſettlement was projected and made on a *religious* account, as well as that of Plymouth, is as clear and indiſputable as any one branch of hiſtory. " There were more than a few attempts of the Eng- " liſh," ſays Dr. MATHER, " to people and improve " the parts of New-England which were to the north- " ward of New-Plymouth; but the deſigns of *thoſe* " attempts being aim'd no higher than the advance- " ment of ſome *worldly intereſts*, a conſtant ſeries of

" diſaſters has confounded them, until there was a " plantation erected upon the nobler *deſigns of chriſ-* " *tianity.* And that plantation—*continues to this day.* " There have been very fine ſettlements in the *north-* " *eaſt* regions: But what is become of them? I have " heard that one of *our* miniſters once preaching to a " congregation there, urged them to approve them- " ſelves a *religious* people from this conſideration, that " otherwiſe they would contradict the *main end* of " planting this wilderneſs: Whereupon a well-known " perſon, then in the aſſembly, cried out, *Sir, you* " *are miſtaken; you think you are preaching to the* " *people at the* [Maſſachuſetts] *Bay*; OUR *main end* " *was to* CATCH FISH." † The reader will naturally compare this with the *Examiner*'s account of the *firſt* ſettlers of ſaid Bay, who, he ſays, " plainly acted as " other men uſually do upon like occaſions, from the " hopes of increaſing their *eſtates*," &c. p. 49.

The Dr. in the ſame chapter, ſpeaking of Sir RICHARD SALTONSTALL and others being aſſociated with Sir HENRY ROSWELL, &c. who had made a purchaſe of the Plymouth company, of that part of New-England which lies between Merrimack and Charles's (alias Charleſtown) river, ſays: " Theſe perſons being aſſociated with the former, and having bought of them all their intereſt in New-England aforeſaid, now conſulted about ſettling a plantation in that country, whither ſuch as were then called *nonconformiſts* might, with the grace and leave of the King, make a peaceable *ſeceſſion*, and enjoy the liberty and exerciſe of their own perſuaſions ‖."—" The perſecuted ſervants of God, under the Engliſh hierarchy, had been in a *ſea of ice mingled with fire*—But the ice was now broken, by the American offers of a *retreat for the pure worſhip of the* LORD JESUS *in a wilderneſs*."—" The God of heaven ſerved as it were a *ſummons* upon the ſpirits of his people in the Engliſh nation; ſtirring up the ſpirits of thouſands which never ſaw the faces of each other, with a moſt unanimous inclination to leave

† *Magnalia*, p. 15. ‖ Page 16.

all the pleaſant accommodations of their native country, and go over a terrible ocean, into a more terrible deſart, *for the pure enjoyment of all his ordinances* †." In the *general conſiderations* for making this plantation, which were then drawn up, this is the firſt, "It will be a ſervice unto the church, to carry the goſpel into thoſe parts of the world, and *raiſe a bulwark againſt the kingdom of Antichriſt* *."——

All this, it muſt be obſerved, relates particularly and expreſly to the Maſſachuſetts Bay, in diſtinction from Plymouth colony. And King WILLIAM, in our Province charter, enjoining on the grantees a *religious* converſation, and taking care to chriſtianize the Indians, adds, "which our royal grandfather—in his "ſaid Letters Patents declared was his royal *intention*, "and the adventurers free *profeſſion* to be the *principal* "*end* of the ſaid plantation."

Let it be obſerved here, that there was a ſmall ſettlement made at *Salem* in 1629, nine years after that at Plymouth, and the year before G. WINTHROP and aſſociates came over. Here a church was founded the ſame year, under the care of the worthy Meſſ. HIGGINSON and SKELTON, after conſultation with their brethren of Plymouth; with whom there ſeems to have been an entire agreement as to eccleſiaſtic affairs. They drew up a church covenant, in a very general, catholic and pious ſtrain, now to be ſeen, *Magnal.* p. 18, 19. And it is particularly recorded, that "*ſome* of the paſſengers, who came over with our firſt *Salemites*, obſerving that our miniſters did not uſe the book of *common prayer* in their adminiſtrations; that they adminiſtred the *baptiſm* and the *ſupper* of our Lord, without any unſcriptural *ceremonies*—they began to raiſe a *deal of trouble* hereupon." But theſe perſons received ſuch an anſwer, that they ſoon "returned into England, with very furious *threatnings* againſt the church thus eſtabliſh'd ‡."

After the arrival of governor WINTHROP, &c. in July 1630, it is particularly recorded, that "they were

† Vid. *Magn.* p. 17. * Ibid. ‡ Vid. *Magn.* p. 19.

were ſo mindful of their *errand* into the wilderneſs, that ſtill one of the *firſt* works was, to gather a church into the *covenant* and *order of the goſpel.*" † Accordingly churches were ſoon founded in the following places and order, on the model of thoſe at Salem and Plymouth; viz. at Charleſtown, Dorcheſter, Boſton, Roxbury, Lynn, Watertown. *Id.* p. 23.

Now, if governor WINTHROP and aſſociates were ſuch good churchmen when they left England, as the *Examiner* ſuppoſes; if they had taken *no diſguſt* at, nor ſuffered any grievances from, the church eſtabliſh'd there, is it not ſtrange that we hear of no eſſays towards ſetting up the church of England worſhip and diſcipline here; nor or of any diſputes relative thereto; but find them unanimous in forming churches upon a quite different model? I will engage to give a much clearer account of the *letter*, on which he builds ſo much, than he can poſſibly give of this harmony and coalition, upon his own hypotheſis. This in general.

Of the principal perſonages who came over at this time, it is certain that they were warm friends to the church-order here ſet up, in diſtinction from that of England. It is ſaid of the Lady ARABELLA JOHNSON, who was one of them, that ſhe "left an earthly *paradiſe* in the family of an *earldom*, to encounter the ſorrows of a *wilderneſs*, for the entertainments of a *pure worſhip* in the houſe of God ‡."—Governor WINTHROP himſelf was a member and warm friend, a great ornament and ſupport of the firſt church in Boſton §. And it is ſaid in Dr. MATHER's life of this truly great and excellent man, that "when the noble deſign of carrying a colony of *choſen people* into an American wilderneſs, was by ſome eminent perſons undertaken; this eminent perſon was, *by the conſent of all*, choſen for the MOSES who muſt be the leader—Wherefore having ſold a fair eſtate of ſix or ſeven hundred a year, he tranſported himſelf with the effects of it into New-England—where he ſpent it upon a famous plantation, founded and formed for the ſeat of the *moſt re-*

† *Magn.* p. 22. ‡ *Magn.* p. 21. § Id. B. II. c. 4.

formed chriſtianity: And continued there, conflicting with temptations of all ſorts †."—The very worthy T. DUDLEY, Eſq; who came over with him in quality of his Lieut. Governor; who was choſen Governor in chief on Mr. WINTHROP's death, and who was alſo one of the ſigners of the *letter* aforeſaid, was one of the *Puritans*, and a *nonconformiſt* before he left England, even when he was a young man: "The ſpirit of real chriſtianity in him, now alſo diſpoſed him unto *ſober nonconformity*; and from this time—he became a judicious *diſſenter* from the unſcriptural ceremonies retained in the church of England."—"The Earl of Lincoln found, that he could be no more without Mr. DUDLEY, than PHARAOH without his JOSEPH, and prevailed with him to reſume his former employment, *until* the ſtorm of perſecution upon the *nonconformiſts* cauſed many men of great worth to tranſport themſelves into New England. Mr. DUDLEY was not the leaſt of the worthy men that bore a part in this tranſportation, *in hopes* that in an American wilderneſs, they might peaceably attend and enjoy the *pure worſhip of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt* ‡."

In this ſame gentleman's own printed *letter* to the Counteſs of Lincoln, written from Boſton the ſame year, I think, that he came hither, there are clear intimations, what was the principal view and aim of the adventurers. "After my brief manner," ſays he, "I ſay this, that if any come hither to plant for "*worldly ends*, that can live *well at home*, he commits "an error, of which he will ſoon repent him—If any "godly men, out of *religious ends*, will come over, "to help us in the *good work we are about*; I think "they cannot diſpoſe of themſelves, nor of their "eſtates more to God's glory, and the furtherance of "their own reckoning."

In a word, the people who came over to New-England in 1630, were, I believe, to a man, thoſe who were called *Puritans*; ſome of them actual nonconformiſts to the church of England, tho' many had not pro-

† *Magn.* B. II. c. 4. ‡ *Magn.* B. II. c. 5.

proceeded ſo far as to ſeparate themſelves from her communion; but all of whom in general, were much diſſatisfied with many things in ſaid church; and had ſuffered, *at leaſt*, reproach for it.

This is evident, I think, beyond doubt, from what has already been obſerved. And "it was for a matter of *twelve years* together," ſays Dr. MATHER, [i. e. after 1630.] "that perſons of all ranks, well affected unto *church-reformation*, kept ſometimes *dropping*, and ſometimes *flocking* into New-England. —The *perſecutors* of thoſe *Puritans*, as they were called, who were now retiring into that cold country from the heat of their perſecution, did all that was poſſible to hinder as many as was poſſible from enjoyment of that *retirement*—that this people ſhould not be *let go*. Among thoſe—that were ſo ſtopt—were OLIVER CROMWELL, Mr. HAMBDEN, and Sir A. HASELRIG. Nevertheleſs, this is not the only inſtance of *perſecuting* churchmens wanting the ſpirit of *prophecy* *." [Alluding to the great part which theſe famous men bore in what was ſoon after done in England.]

To thoſe which precede, let me add the joint teſtimony of the Rev. Meſſieurs JOHN ALLIN of Dedham, and THOMAS SHEPHERD of Cambridge, New-England. Theſe were perſons of great note in their day, both of them learned men, among the *very early* ‡ ſettlers in the Maſſachuſetts-Bay; and both of them grown men before the famous embarkation of 1630. So that they muſt have known not only their own motives in coming hither, but thoſe of the other adventurers in general. This teſtimony is contained in a certain *preface*, ſigned by them jointly, dated New-England, Nov. 28, 1645. One principal deſign of which preface was, to juſtify the great reſort into America, againſt ſome complaints of their friends, the Puritans and nonconformiſts in England, as if they had deſerted them and the good cauſe of *reformation* there.

* *Magn.* p. 23.

‡ Mr. Shepherd came over in 1634. When Mr. Allin came, I am not ſo certain.

In anſwer, among other things, they ſay: "Let us intreat all the godly wiſe to conſider and look back upon the ſeaſon of this great enterpriſe, undertaken by us—and we think, tho' we were ſilent, they may eaſily ſatisfy themſelves, whether this was of God or men; a ſinful *neglect* of the cauſe of Chriſt, or a manifeſt *atteſtation* to the truth, by open profeſſion againſt *corruptions* of worſhip in uſe, and for the neceſſity of *reformation* of the church; and that confirmed by *no ſmall* degree of ſufferings for the ſame. For was it not a time when human worſhip and inventions were grown to ſuch an intolerable height, that the conſciences of God's ſaints and ſervants—could no longer bear them? Was not the power of the *tyrannical prelates* ſo great, that like a ſtrong current, carried all down ſtream before it?"—"And what would men have us do in ſuch a caſe? Muſt we ſtudy ſome diſtinctions to ſalve our conſciences in complying with ſo *manifold* corruptions in God's worſhip? or ſhould we live without God's ordinances?"—"It is true, we might have *ſuffered*, if we had ſought it; we might eaſily have found the way to have *filled the priſons*; and *ſome* had their ſhare therein. But whether we were called thereunto, when a wide door was ſet open of *liberty* otherwiſe; and our *witneſs* to the truth, thro' the malignant policy of thoſe times, could not be open before the world, but rather *ſmothered* up in cloſe *priſons*, or ſome ſuch ways, together with ourſelves, we leave to be conſidered. We cannot ſee, but the rule of Chriſt to his apoſtles and ſaints, and the practice of God's ſaints in all ages, may allow us this liberty as well as others, to *fly into the wilderneſs from the face of the* DRAGON."—"We ſhould be an object of tenderneſs to that ſtate and people, by whoſe laws and unkind uſages we were *driven out into a wilderneſs*."—

The *Examiner* having thought proper to uſe the late very inquiſitive and ſtudious Mr. PRINCE's teſtimony on this occaſion, I conclude he will not object againſt my making ſome *addition* to it, out of the ſame Book; which I conſider as an authentic account of the perſons

ſons by whom, and the motives on which, this colony was peopled. After ſpeaking largely of the Puritans and their ſufferings, he ſays: "Of theſe Engliſh *Puritans* were the *greater part* of the ſettlers of the *Maſſachuſetts colony*. They had been *chiefly* born and brought up in the national church, and had *hitherto* lived in communion with her—Tho' with *multitudes* of others, labouring under *grievous impoſitions*, conflicting with many difficulties, and looking earneſtly for better times; *till* the high-flying biſhops both increaſed the ceremonies, and grew ſo rigorous in impoſing them, as to allow no worſhip in the church without them: Yea, ſo ſeverely *proſecute* thoſe who could not in *conſcience* uſe them, as to let them live *no longer* in their native land in quiet. Finding therefore the impoſitions growing, loſing all farther hopes of *reformation* and *indulgence* there; and New-England opening her arms to embrace them; they judged they now ought to improve the offer, and rather chuſe a hideous *wilderneſs*; that here, being free from all *reſtraint*, they might ſet up churches, in their worſhip, matter, form and diſcipline, intirely after the New Teſtament model; enjoy theſe great and chriſtian liberties *without diſturbance*, and tranſmit them, as what they accounted their deareſt legacy, to their perpetual ſucceſſors †."

To theſe let me ſubjoin one more teſtimony: It ſhall be from the venerable *Society* themſelves, in their hiſtorical *Account*, An. 1706. p. 10. "It *muſt* be "acknowledged, that it was the unhappineſs of New-"England and the adjoining parts, to be firſt planted "and inhabited by perſons who were *generally diſaf-"fected* to the church of England, and had *many of* "*them taken* REFUGE *or retirement in thoſe parts, on* "*account of their ſuffering for* NONCONFORMITY at "home."

It ſhould be remembered that all theſe teſtimonies, except the laſt, (and it were eaſy to fill volumes with others to the ſame purpoſe) relate particularly and directly to the ſettlers of the Maſſachuſetts Bay, as diſ-

† N. E. *Chron.* Vol. I. p. 239.

tinct from Plymouth colony; and they ſpeak for themſelves.

But let me make a ſhort remark or two, relative to the *letter* of Governor WINTHROP, &c. on which the *Examiner* lays ſo much ſtreſs ‡. And,

1. He ſpeaks of this letter as written on purpoſe to *exculpate* themſelves from the *ſlanderous* report of their intending to ſet up a form of worſhip, different from the national eſtabliſhment, as thoſe of Plymouth had done before. But,

2. If this was their principal deſign, it is very ſtrange they *did not do ſo*. There is not a ſyllable in the letter, that implies they had no ſuch purpoſe. They ſpeak, indeed, very reſpectfully of the church of England, calling her their *mother*; deſire the prayers of their brethren *in* and *of* her; and ſay, they did not dream of *perfection* in this world, &c. In this they diſcover their great *charity* and *moderation*: But all this falls far ſhort of a declaration, that they were not diſguſted with many things in the national church, and that they had no intention to ſet up a different way of worſhip; as it is known they unanimouſly did, immediately on their arrival here.

3. In this very letter, I mean a part of it which the *Examiner* did not think proper to quote, as not being for his purpoſe, there is a *poſitive* and *clear* intimation of their having ſome *peculiar* opinions and principles in religious matters. "If any there be," ſay they, "who thro' want of clear intelligence of our courſe, "or tenderneſs of *affection* towards us, *cannot conceive* "*ſo well of* OUR WAY as we could deſire, we would "intreat ſuch not to *deſpiſe* us, nor to deſert us in "their prayers and affections," &c. Thoſe words, OUR WAY, plainly refer to their principles and practices

‡ Upon what authority the *Examiner* ſays, this letter was *directed to the biſhops and clergy, and people of the church of England*, I am quite at a loſs. In the Edition before me, Boſton 1696. the direction is, To the reſt of *their brethren in and of the church of England*. And whom they *chiefly* intended by *their brethren*, &c. there can be little room for doubt: Certainly not the high-flying perſecutors of the *Puritans*.

tices as *Puritans*, which had rendered them obnoxious, and for which they had been ſufferers.

4. Can the *Examiner* himſelf poſſibly imagine that this letter is of *any* weight in the ſcale, againſt ſo many clear teſtimonies as have been produced, relating to the ſentiments, ſufferings and motives of theſe renowned adventurers, and to the manner of worſhip and diſcipline which they immediately and unanimouſly fell into, on their arrival here; in conformity to the churches before founded at Plymouth and Salem? The utmoſt that can be made of this letter, appears to me to be this: The good men were deeply affected with the thoughts of leaving their native country, and going into an American wilderneſs: They recollected, that they had been moſtly born and bred in the church of England, in which they ſuppoſed there were great numbers of excellent men, between whom and themſelves the difference was but ſmall, tho' they had received ſuch ill uſage from the *governing* part: They were deſirous to take their farewell upon as friendly and good terms as poſſibly they could, with a ſafe conſcience: They therefore ſeem to bury and forget all the reproach and hardſhips they had undergone as Puritans: They wiſh well to the church of England; honor her as their mother, and deſire the prayers of all good people in her communion, notwithſtanding *their own way* was thought ſo ill of by many. This, as was intimated before, is a glorious example of true greatneſs of mind, of generoſity and catholiciſm, of chriſtian meekneſs and charity;—ſuch as is rarely to be found. More than this cannot be fairly made of it, conſidering what is certainly known of theſe perſons, and how they conducted on their arrival in America: And leſs than this I do not deſire ſhould be made of it. Nor will it even admit of the *leaſt* rational doubt, but that they had, at the very time of their writing the letter, a formal deſign to ſet up purer and more ſcriptural churches in the new world, than that which they left eſtabliſhed in the old; at leaſt purer in their own apprehenſions.

Let

Let me therefore make one more remark here; it is this, That if I had ſpoken in the *Obſervations*, of the principles, motives and ſufferings of the Maſſachuſett-adventurers, as diſtinguiſhed from the Plymothean; yet it would have been conformable to ſtrict hiſtorical truth, tho' my *Examiner* calls all this a *ſtale pretence*. I will not inſult the man who appears ſo unacquainted with the matters he wrote of, unleſs it be doing ſo, juſt to remind him of his own words: His calm reflections on this occaſion, if he is a perſon of any *candor* or ingenuity, will give him ſufficient uneaſineſs.—"The firſt ſettlers of the Maſſachuſetts "Bay at leaſt, thoſe pious good men, who left *the* "*fair cities*, &c. did not do it from *any diſguſt* they "had taken at the eſtabliſh'd religion of their country; "but from quite *other* motives."—"Read, my dear "countrymen, read the words of our pious forefathers "in the above letter, and compare them with this "author's *licentious harangue*."—"Let the Dr. con-"ſider what recompence he can make to the memory "of theſe men, for abuſing them with the oppro-"brious charge of ſectariſm and hypocriſy."—i. e. Becauſe I am ſuppoſed to have ſpoken of them as taking refuge in America for conſcience ſake, and coming hither as to an aſſylum from the perſecutions of the church of England! This, in his *candid* opinion, is to *abuſe* them as *hypocrites* as well as *ſectaries*; and to bring an *opprobrious* charge againſt them †.—

SEC.

† As to the *Examiner*'s recriminations with reſpect to the nonconformiſts having perſecuted in their turn, even in New-England; I am ſenſible he has too much occaſion for this. He is alſo ſenſible, and ought to have had the *candor* to acknowledge it, that I declared expreſly in the *Obſervations*, that I would not undertake their defence in this reſpect. So that he might have ſav'd himſelf a great deal of labor, p. 54. and onwards; ſince he is not diſputing here with me, or any other perſon, ſo far as I can tell. I am miſtaken, however, if he would not be glad to ſee them become perſecutors again, at leaſt of *one man*.——

SECTION IX.

Containing ſome ſhort Remarks on various unconnected matters in the Examination, *from p. 57 to 69.*

FIRST, He ſpeaks highly of "teſts;" and inſinuates that my manner of writing on this occaſion, has a tendency to ſtir up a ſpirit of "perſecution" againſt the church, which, he ſays, is "already eſta-"bliſhed here;" he alſo ſays, "teſts are already or-"dained, and in many caſes required, as they are in "England."—He accuſes me of "perſuading people "to unite in excluding thoſe of the church of Eng-"land, not only from all poſts of honor and emolu-"ment, but even from the common rights and pri-"vileges of natural born ſubjects; a ſcheme ſo no-"toriouſly factious and unjuſt," &c. &c. p. 57, 58.

Let me here briefly remark,

1. It does not yet appear that the church of England is *already eſtabliſhed here.*

2. Every one knew, without his information, that *certain* officers who bear the King's commiſſion in the colonies, muſt *qualify*, by communicating in the church of England. And by the manner of his ſpeaking of *teſts*, it may naturally be preſumed that he is much troubled, that this is not generally, or rather univerſally required;—that our counſellors, repreſentatives, judges, juſtices, ſheriffs, militia-officers, &c. are not all obliged to *qualify* in the ſame way; and that *ſchiſmatics* may be admitted to theſe places of public truſt.

3. That I aim'd at perſuading people to unite in excluding thoſe of the church of England, *not only from all poſts of honor and emolument, but even from the*

the common rights and privileges of natural born ſubjects, is abſolutely falſe. I did not excite them to unite in excluding them even from poſts of honor and emolument; which would have been a very fooliſh and fruitleſs, not to ſay *factious ſcheme*; eſpecially while the Governor, who has the ſole appointment of military officers, the nomination of civil, and a negative upon the choice of counſellors here, muſt be a conformiſt—Much leſs did I excite people to unite in excluding epiſcopalians from the *common rights and privileges of natural born ſubjects*. But I am free to own, that I expreſſed my apprehenſions of the government and all offices here, coming *wholly* into the hands of churchmen, which many ſeem deſirous of. I am equally willing to own, tho' I did not ſay ſo before, that I think it would be little ſhort of infatuation for the people here, on any occaſion to favour thoſe with their *votes*, who are *bigots* to the ſaid church; who contemn and deſpiſe all nonconformiſts thereto, who deſire to deprive them of their ancient privileges, to trample and cruſh them under their feet.—This would be to put a ſword into the hands of their enemies. Theſe ſentiments I avow; and this is the moſt, and even more than can be ſtrictly made of that paſſage in the *Obſervations*, at which ſome epiſcopalians have been ſo much enraged.

4. As to perſecution; I have ever had the utmoſt abhorrence of it in every ſhape, as my mean writings, from firſt to laſt, clearly teſtify. And I ſolemnly declare, I had much rather ſuffer it myſelf, than promote it againſt others. The *Obſervations* themſelves ſtrongly expreſs my ſentiments as to this matter.

Secondly, The *Examiner* makes a flouriſh about epiſcopacy and the liturgy, p. 60, 61, 62, 63. But as he has offered nothing of the leaſt conſequence upon theſe heads, I let what he ſays paſs without any particular remarks. Tho' if he had talked more to the purpoſe than he has, I ſhould have declined entering upon ſo extenſive an argument at preſent, for the reaſons aſſigned in my *Introduction*. He, and thoſe of his own

own ſtamp, may, if they pleaſe, attribute this either to my ſuſpicion of the grounds of our nonconformity, or to my fear of his great *learning* and *abilities* in this controverſy.—I can, however, hardly forbear taking a little time juſt to *ſmile* at the *authorities* which he produces on this occaſion; particularly the laſt. He tells us, p. 63. that Dr. DURELL received the compliments of three or four reformed miniſters in France, on his ſermon in praiſe of the liturgy. Theſe he has produced with great formality in French and Engliſh, on oppoſite columns. That which crowns all, as being the moſt *a la mode* and ſublime, the very apex, culmen and quinteſſence of French compliment, is expreſſed thus—"If you ſtood in need of an approba-"tion, *after that of your biſhop's* CHAPLAIN, I would "willingly add MINE *to the ſame!*" †

Thirdly, In p. 64, 65 & 66. the *Examiner* very formally ſums up what he calls "the argument on both ſides." All that needs be ſaid of this at preſent, is, that he ſeems perfectly ſatisfied with himſelf, and to think he had done wonders—

——————"Reviewing what he writ,
"Bleſſes his ſtars, and wonders at his *wit*."

The wonder of his readers may, however, probably be much more excited at *ſomething elſe*, on this occaſion.

Fourthly, He expreſſes his hope, in the laſt mentioned page, that the *Society* will continue their miſſions here; and his confidence, however that may be, that God will "direct to ſufficient means for the *pre-*"*ſervation* of HIS CHURCH." As to the *latter* of which,

† Whoever would ſee the principles of our nonconformity, and the validity of our ordinations clearly vindicated, may have that ſatisfaction particularly from Mr. DELANE'S *Plea for the Nonconformiſts*, Mr. J. PIERCE'S *Vindication of the Diſſenters*, The *Anſwer to Mr.* WHITE'S *Letters*, and Dr. CHAUNCY'S (of Boſton) ſermon at the *Dudleian Lecture*, 1762, intitled, *The Validity of Preſbyterian ordination aſſerted and maintained*. The reader will in theſe find ſomething much more ſolid and ſatisfactory, than in the ſcraps which the *Examiner* has cited from *Calvin* and *Beza*, or even in thoſe French *Compliments*, on which he lays ſo great a ſtreſs.

which, I heartily concur with him; and would accordingly, if he will excuſe ſuch a piece of vanity and preſumption in me, take it upon me to officiate as his *clerk*, by ſaying AMEN! Only obſerving, it is my humble opinion, that the *church of God* would be much better preſerved, and more effectually propagated, if the *Society*, in their wiſdom, ſhould think proper to ſend their miſſionaries into other parts.

Fifthly, He next ſpeaks of my "indecent and abuſive treatment of them" [the Society.] This charge I deny: It was neither *indecent* nor *abuſive* in me to endeavour to ſhew by clear arguments, that the *Society* had in part miſapplied their charity; unleſs I had alſo charged them with *known, wilful* miſconduct, as I did not. This is ſuch a liberty as is agreeable to the laws and cuſtoms of Great Britain; and, which is much more, to the ſpirit and precepts of religion. And the reader is left to judge, whether my *Examiner* has not injured the *Society* far more than I have done, by laboring to prove, that if they have miſconducted, they have *wilfully* betrayed their truſt. Let him therefore, to uſe his own words, "conſider what reparation he ought in conſcience to make," &c. p. 44.

Sixthly, He blames me, p. 67. for not rather writing an account of the ſucceſs of another religious *Society*, than objecting againſt the conduct of this. To which I ſhall only anſwer, that I was at my liberty; and thought there was more occaſion for the latter than the former; this occaſion being given by Mr. APTHORP's officious and indiſcreet zeal.

Seventhly, He commends Mr. WHEELOCK's ſcheme, p. 68. I am glad he can approve of any thing done towards the converſion of the heathens, by thoſe who, according to his principles, are unorthodox, ſectaries and hypocrites. This is what I hardly expected.

Eighthly, In the ſame and the next page, he juſtifies all the virulence and abuſe that have been ſo plentifully beſtowed on me on this occaſion; ſaying that I have "no right to complain," &c. To which I ſhall only anſwer, that he who can thus deliberately juſtify ſuch out-

outrages, adopts, and makes them his own; and thereby ſhews, if poſſible, a more rancorous ſpirit than that which dictated them at firſt.

Laſtly, He ſpeaks of me, p. 69, as one of thoſe who ought to be "rebuked ſharply." And no one, ſurely, who reads any part of his virulent pamphlet, can in the leaſt doubt, but that he thought himſelf a very proper perſon to undertake that office: But whether he is or not, other perſons may reaſonably doubt, ſince he is aſhamed of his *name*.

SECTION X.

Of ſome ingenuous *and* candid *methods taken by the* Examiner, *in order to render the Author of the* Obſervations *odious; and of what was apparently his farther view therein.*

IT is no new practice for thoſe who write upon controverted matters, to ſet the perſons againſt whom they write, in the moſt diſadvantageous point of light; and to take ſuch methods in order thereto, as every chriſtian, gentleman and ſcholar ought to have in contempt and abhorrence. If my *candid Examiner* excells in any thing, I think it is in ſuch arts as theſe: And, by what I can learn, this is the general opinion of the moſt unprejudiced among us. I ſhall not pretend to enumerate all the particulars which he has ſaid with the aforeſaid deſign; but ſome of them only, as they occur to my mind. And,

Firſt, He has repreſented me as an enemy to the government under which I live, by ſpeaking of me as an enemy to *all kings*. It is with this view, undoubtedly, that ſpeaking of king WILLIAM, he ſays, he was a prince for whom I "*pretend* a reſpect, at leaſt as "much as I am capable of paying to *any crowned*

" *head*," p. 23. And immediately after, to prove my implacable hatred of *all* kings, he quotes one of my ſermons, in which I ſaid, " The *greateſt part* of " mankind now are, and almoſt always have been, " oppreſſed by wicked *tyrants*, called civil rulers, " kings and emperors; oppreſſed by God's ſcourges, " that call themſelves *his miniſters for good*."—A fact which hardly any perſon converſant in hiſtory will pretend to deny. But why did he not go a little farther, and repreſent me as an enemy to all civil government in general; ſince, in the paſſage he quoted, I uſe the general terms *civil rulers?* But tho' it is my opinion, that the " greateſt part" of mankind are thus abuſed by kings, or other rulers, methinks a logician would not infer from hence, that I think they *all* are; and conſequently, that *all* kings and civil rulers are *tyrants*.—It is with the ſame candid deſign, that he ſays, I call *kings* " ſcepter'd tyrants," p. 70. as if I had applied thoſe epithets to *all* kings indiſcriminately, as characteriſtic of them. Whereas it is evident from the paſſage to which he refers, that I uſed them only concerning ſome particular arbitrary and perſecuting kings. This he *muſt* have known; and he might have known alſo, that in many of my printed diſcourſes, I ſpeak of good kings with the higheſt reverence; particularly of king WILLIAM, and all the princes of the HANOVERIAN ſucceſſion: And he is, perhaps, diſguſted that I have praiſed theſe princes ſo much, inſtead of extolling thoſe of the STEWART family. For he diſcovers his diſlike to what I have occaſionally ſaid about the latter.

Secondly, He has ranſack'd my ſermons, publiſhed at different times, for fifteen or ſixteen years paſt, and which he ſomewhere, I think, ſmartly ſays, are *ſufficiently voluminous*; picking out expreſſions, ſcraps of ſentences, and words, which he thinks harſh and exceptionable. This he has generally done without the leaſt regard to the ſcope and connection of the paſſages from whence he has cull'd them, and tho' many of them had no relation to the point in hand. A more particular notice

tice will be taken of what he ſays upon this head: At preſent I only obſerve in general, the ingenuity of this gentleman in taking ſuch a method to render me odious; and then pleading theſe detach'd words and expreſſions, which he has raked together with ſo much malicious diligence, as a juſtification of all the ribaldry and perſonal abuſes that have been vented againſt me on this occaſion. And what is the evident tendency of what he has offered upon this head, but to excite every perſon, eſpecially epiſcopalians, (many of whom needed no ſtimulus) to treat me with all the rudeneſs and ſcurrility they are capable of?—I aver, that if one were to take this ſame liberty with the writings even of Dr. Tillotſon, and the moſt eminent divines of the church of England;—nay, with the writings of St. Paul, and other apoſtles;—yea, with the diſcourſes of our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, who was ſo "meek and lowly in heart," it would be eaſy to find detach'd expreſſions in them on different occaſions, which would at firſt view have the appearance of great harſhneſs and ſeverity; ſuch as might ſeem not eaſily reconciled with the gentle ſpirit and the precepts of the goſpel, tho' perfectly agreeable thereto in reality, when the occaſion and circumſtances are duly attended to.——In hunting thus after exceptionable words and expreſſions, from ſermon to ſermon, how much leſs reſemblance does this *candid* gentleman bear to the *bee*, than to ſome leſs *cleanly* inſects, which delight more in what is unſavory, than in honey or the honeycomb?—Mean as my diſcourſes are, he might have found in them many things ſalutary to the ſoul, and particularly adapted to rectify *ſuch a diſpoſition* as he diſcovers.

I would indeed rather apologize for, than undertake fully to juſtify, ſome particular expreſſions which I have uſed. Much wiſer and better men than I am, have ſometimes *ſpoken unadviſedly with their lips*. But I think I have no occaſion even to apologize for moſt of the expreſſions, againſt which he excepts. I ſhall go over thoſe which he has ſo induſtriouſly raked to-

gether, from p. 70. to 76. incluſive; making ſome ſhort remarks on them, that the impartial reader may judge between us.—" Scepter'd tyrants."—This was not ſaid of kings in general, as he maliciouſly inſinuates; but of bad kings only. " The *greateſt part* of " mankind now are, and always have been, oppreſſed " by wicked tyrants, called civil rulers, kings," &c. This is agreeable to ſtrict hiſtorical truth; let him, if he can, prove the contrary. " An enormous hierarchy, aſcending by various gradations from the dirt to the ſkies."—Let the reader conſider a poor, half-ſtarv'd *curate* in England, with only 10 or 12 *l.* ſterl. per ann. and then riſe in his imagination along the ſcale of rectors, prebendaries, deans, commiſſaries, arch-deacons, &c. till he comes to biſhops and arch-biſhops, who have 8, 10 or 12,000 *l.* ſterl. a year, with place and rank next to the royal family, and power in proportion: Let him then conſider, whether ſuch an hierarchy as this, does not come pretty near to the aforeſaid deſcription; and whether it is not very different from any which we find in the New Teſtament, whatever regard it may claim, conſidered as authoriſed by the laws of England. " An hierarchy reſembling that of the Romiſh church, where one great prelate preſides," &c. Any perſon who will turn to my *Obſ.* p. 67. may ſee that this is not directly aſſerted concerning the Engliſh hierarchy; but, if it had been, it would have been ſtrictly true. And he that denies any *reſemblance* between theſe hierarchies, either knows nothing of the matter, or cares not what he denies. " One of our kings was wheedled and duped to his deſtruction, by the furious epiſcopal zealots of that day."—Strictly juſt and true. " The perſecuting antichriſtian ſpirit of *many* prelates *before the revolution*."—This is expreſſed with great tenderneſs and moderation, and needs not the leaſt apology. " Biſhops and their underlings." —And who will deny, that biſhops have uſually many *underlings?* Tho' this was not uſed by me as a term of contempt and reproach reſpecting the *perſons* of all thoſe who are in office ſubordinate to biſhops, in the

church

church of England; but with reference to the known principles of nonconformiſts, who ſuppoſe and prove that, according to the New Teſtament, an elder or preſbyter is not an officer inferior to a biſhop, but the ſame. "The mitred, lordly ſucceſſors of the fiſhermen of Galilee."—That biſhops wear mitres, ſit in the houſe of Lords as Peers, are *called of men Lords*; and that they call themſelves ſucceſſors of the apoſtles, who were ſome of them fiſhermen of Galilee, will not be denied. What then does my Cenſor find fault with in this? If he ſays, that the expreſſion taken altogether, has the air of reproach and ſarcaſm; I need not deny it. But then he ſhould not have repreſented it, as if applied by me to all biſhops in general; for it is uſed in the very place from whence he took it, (*Obſ.* p. 128.) only concerning thoſe imperious, tyrannical ones, who cruelly haraſſed our forefathers—"When "we reflect *what our forefathers ſuffered* from the "mitred, lordly ſucceſſors," &c. For this I ſhall make no apology. "*Before the revolution*, epiſcopal perſecution was ſeconded by royal power; which condeſcended to be ſubſervient to the views of domineering prelates."—Strictly juſt, without the leaſt need of apology. "Their unholy zeal and oppreſſions were countenanced by ſcepter'd tyrants."—Strictly juſt again. He ſays, I have characterized the church of England, as "a cruel perſecuting church;" but he is forced immediately to acknowledge, that I expreſly confine this deſcription of her, to the times "before the revolution:" Which he *candidly* attributes to my fearing "the cenſure of civil authority." This, I deny; let him prove it. This character of ſaid church, as reſtrained to thoſe times, needs not the leaſt apology. Nay, it is but too apparent, that her being ſuch a church no longer, is much more owing to the juſtice and mildneſs of the civil government, than to the diſpoſition of *many* of her ſons, and even of her clergy. Tho' I doubt not, but that the biſhops are now generally perſons of moderation; lovers of civil and chriſtian liberty, as well as of learning; and en-

couragers of the latter even among nonconformiſts: In which reſpects I highly honor them.

He comes next to my ſermon relative to the 30th of Jan. preached 1750. In the preface to which, he ſays, I "ſpeak of biſhops and the clergy in general, "under the title of *imperious biſhops* and *reverend* "*jockies*." This, he muſt give me leave to tell him, is an abſolute, right down—falſehood. He muſt have known it to be ſo, if he read the paſſage to which he refers, inſtead of taking his account from vague report. This will appear to be a falſehood, when the paſſage itſelf is produced. After ſpeaking of eccleſiaſtical tyranny, as the "moſt cruel, intolerable and "impious of any," I go on thus—"From ſmall be-"ginnings it *exalts itſelf above all that is called God* "*and that is worſhipped*;" [herein particularly referring to the tyranny of the church of Rome] "People "have no ſecurity againſt being unmercifully prieſt-"ridden, but by keeping *all imperious* biſhops, and "*other* clergymen *who love to lord it over God's heri-*"*tage*, from getting their foot into the *ſtirrup* at all:" [i. e. from getting too much power] "Let *them* be "once fairly *mounted*, and their *beaſts the laity* may "prance and flounce about to no purpoſe: And they "will at length be ſo jaded and hack'd by *theſe reve-*"*rend jockies*, that they will not even have ſpirits "enough to complain that their *backs* are galled, or, like "*Balaam*'s aſs, to rebuke the madneſs of the prophet." Now who ſees not that, in this paſſage, I ſpeak only of *ſome* biſhops under the character of *imperious*; as I do, only of *ſome other* clergymen, who love to *lord it over God's heritage?*—and that it is only *ſuch* biſhops, and *ſuch* other clergymen, whom I call *reverend jockies?* Is there the leaſt foundation for ſaying, that I call them all ſo? This expreſſion may indeed be rather too *ludicrous*; the hypocriſy and wickedneſs of *ſuch* men, and the miſchiefs they do, being things perhaps of too *ſerious* a nature to be made a *jeſt* of. This expreſſion, however, was not uſed in a ſermon: Nor do I ſee any occaſion to apologize for it; tho' I will not diſpute

taſtes

taſtes with thoſe, who have leſs of the *riſible* in their conſtitution than myſelf, or who may think it improperly indulged upon ſuch an occaſion; as I do not—But he ſays, that in the ſermon aforeſaid, "they [i. e. *biſhops* and the *clergy in general*, the immediate antecedents] are ſtiled *reverend and right reverend drones, who preach but once a year*," &c. This is another abſolute falſehood. So far was I from ſtyling them ſo in *general*, that I did not expreſly call *any* of them ſo; as any one may ſee, by turning to the ſermon, p. 21. The expreſſion is intirely hypothetical; and introduced only to illuſtrate the argument I was upon, about kings:—"*Suppoſe* farther, that a number of reverend and right "reverend drones, who worked not," &c. And even this hypothetical ſimilitude, brought in for illuſtration, is introduced with the following precaution.—"It is no matter *how far* it is from any thing which has *in fact* happened in the world."—But what if I had expreſly deſcribed *ſome* biſhops and other clergymen, as *reverend and right reverend drones, who work not*, but only eat the honey; would this have been juſtly exceptionable? Are there not many ſuch, at leaſt in Popiſh countries? This needs no apology.—To proceed—"He [K. Ch. I.] ſupported that *more than fiend* archbiſhop Laud, and the clergy of his ſtamp, in all their church tyranny and helliſh cruelty."—This is the firſt expreſſion produced by him, which is not juſtifiable; but this I concede only with reference to thoſe two words, *more than*—I confeſs this was rather too *hyperbolical*. I would therefore correct the expreſſion in ſuch a manner as will, I hope, make it almoſt, if not quite unexceptionable, thus—"That *fiend incarnate* archbiſhop "Laud," &c. leaving out the words *more than*.—"There ſeems to have been an impious bargain ſtruck up betwixt the ſcepter and the ſurplice, for enſlaving both the bodies and ſouls of men," &c.—Tho' there is an *edge* on ſome of theſe expreſſions; yet it was not without ſufficient reaſon; nor is there any occaſion to apologize for it.—"Some contend, and foam, and curſe their brethren, for the ſake of the Athanaſian *tri-*

nity, till 'tis evident they do not love and fear the one living and true God," &c. Theſe expreſſions, and thoſe which follow, *Ex.* p. 74. will appear to be very little, if at all exceptionable, when it is conſidered that they were uſed expreſly concerning ſome *hypocritical* zealots for a party, in a ſermon on the *deceitfulneſs of the heart*. Why ſhould my *candid Examiner* thus take the part of *hypocrites*, or think them too *harſhly* dealt with? Some may perhaps ſuſpect, not wholly without grounds, that what chiefly *diſguſted* him in this paragraph of the ſermon aforeſaid, was a ſentence or two immediately preceding thoſe which he has cited;—and left out by him, for a reaſon that ſhall be nameleſs. The foregoing words are, "There are none, "perhaps, who have more reaſon to be ſuſpicious of "themſelves, than your hot religious *zealots*, the "great ſticklers for what they call *orthodoxy*; whe- "ther juſtly or unjuſtly, it now matters not. You "will ſometimes ſee men wrangling in ſuch an un- "chriſtian manner, about the *form of godlineſs*, as to "make it but too evident, that they deny the *power* "*thereof*. You will find ſome who pride themſelves "in being of what they call THE TRUE CHURCH, "ſhewing, by their whole *converſation*, that they are "of the *ſynagogue of Satan*. Some contend and foam," &c. This is the connection: I would, however, hope that my *Examiner* is not one of the perſons here deſcribed, notwithſtanding he thinks I have treated them with too much harſhneſs and ſeverity. But hypocriſy is ſo much the object of my averſion, and hypocrites are ſo ſeverely handled by our Saviour and his apoſtles, that I do not think I have occaſion to apologize for what I ſay of them, to this gentleman, or any *ſincere* chriſtian. Does he think it belongs only to his *own* important, tho' unknown *ſelf*, to *rebuke ſharply?*

I cannot but admire the *candor* and modeſty of this *Examiner*, who, after ſearching many ſermons for the ſeveral expreſſions aforeſaid; after intirely miſrepreſenting the ſenſe of moſt of them, and then jumbling them

them all together, ſays, "It will be doubtleſs *diſagree-*
"*able* to the reader to be any longer entertained with
"expreſſions and obſervations, ſo utterly *unbecoming*
"*a miniſter of* JESUS CHRIST."—How dared the man to mention that ever ſacred and venerable *name* thus, after treating me in this *heatheniſh* manner!—If I need an apology for any expreſſions in the ſermon on the 30th of January, beſides that which relates to archbiſhop Laud; I have one at hand. There was great *provocation* to uſe ſevere expreſſions about that time, and before.

Some of the epiſcopal clergy here, uſed, on the ſame occaſion, to aſſert the divine, hereditary and indefeaſable right of kings, in direct, manifeſt oppoſition to the principles of the *revolution*; almoſt deifying archbiſhop LAUD as well as CHARLES I; calumniating nonconformiſts as ſchiſmaticks, fanaticks, perſons of republican, rebellious principles; and imitating, *as far as they were capable*, the manner and ſtile of the keeneſt, ſevereſt ſermons ever publiſhed in England on the ſame occaſion. This is well known; and may not this be conſidered by the *candid*, as ſome apology for me, if not a full vindication? Let me add, that it is ſuppoſed by many, that the epiſcopal clergy have ſince preached in a more moderate ſtrain upon the ſaid occaſion: Which ſome, I know, attribute in part to the publication of my ſermon. If there is any ground for this, I am humbly of opinion that it has done *ſome good*; and that they ought to think themſelves obliged to me for the ſhare I have had in keeping them from *expoſing themſelves* till this time, in the way that ſome of them uſed to do before.——

Let me here briefly take notice of a ſuppoſed inconſiſtency charged upon me, *Ex.* p. 76. The gentleman ſays, Mr. *Apthorp* had obſerved, "that the
"religious ſtate of the country is manifeſtly improved
"as to its *ſpeculative doctrines*, notwithſtanding the
"immoralities which we lament and wiſh to reform."
He immediately adds, "After ſpending ſeveral pages
"(*viz.* from 71 to 78.) to confute *this poſition*,

" the Dr. concludes as in the oppoſite column"—Now, in ſaid column, I am truly cited as conceding that chriſtianity, *ſpeculatively* conſidered, may be better underſtood in this age, than in that of our fathers: But ſtill the inconſiſtency charged upon me, is an abſolute, apparent falſhood. For if the reader will be pleaſed to turn to the pages which the *Examiner* refers to in the *Obſervations*, he will find that I never once denied " this poſition," *viz.* " That the religious " ſtate of the country is manifeſtly improved as to its " *ſpeculative* doctrines;" much leſs, ſpent nine pages " to confute *this poſition*," as he hath the *preſence* to aſſert. Nor did Mr. *Apthorp*'s aſſertions relate *only* to ſpeculative doctrines: He ſpoke of the *ſavage and gloomy appearance* with which *ſuperſtition* terribly arrayed religion in the days of our fathers; and of the *hypocriſy* and *perſecution* in reſpect of which, as he ſuppoſed, we have been reformed by means of the *Society* and their miſſionaries. Theſe were the *poſitions* that I confuted in the pages aforeſaid; without once denying, that better *ſpeculative* opinions in ſome reſpects now prevail, than formerly did. Nor have I the leaſt reaſon to think that the palpable falſehood of this repreſentation, as to an inconſiſtency, was undeſigned; —except only the *title* of the pamphlet which contains it. There is indeed a remarkable " contraſt" betwixt the *truth* and this repreſentation; and, in his own words on this occaſion, it is " left to ſpeak for itſelf."

SEC-

SECTION XI.

More of the Examiner's candor; *particularly in repreſenting his* antagoniſt *as an impious* heretic *or* deiſt; *and accuſing him of denying certain doctrines, which he is known to maintain.*

IT is a ſtale art of bigots and party-men, to repreſent thoſe who appear in oppoſition to their deſigns, as deiſts, or heretics at beſt; as denying the eſſential, fundamental doctrines of chriſtianity, &c. in order to deſtroy their influence, and to inflame the unenlightened zeal of the multitude againſt them. Whether this *candid* gentleman has, or has not, made uſe of this art, in a manner hardly to be paralleled, ſhall be ſubmitted to the judgment of the reader, when I have produced the proofs of it under his own hand. And here I muſt look back as far as the 47th page of his libel, where, ſpeaking of our fathers, he ſays: "Could the Dr. have mentioned theſe good fa-" thers without bluſhing, if he had reflected how " widely he has departed from the faith which theſe " good men profeſſed, and that as to the *moſt eſſen-* " *tial* doctrines of chriſtianity? Or muſt we take his " appeals and harrangues of this kind to be mere gri-" mace, or rather a deſign calculated *ad captum vulgi*, " to raiſe a ferment in the minds of people, who can-" not help retaining, and that very juſtly, a value for " the memory of their progenitors? Whatever their " notions of liberty, or purity of religion amounted " to, they certainly had no great opinion of *the* " *learned Socinus*; they entertained thoſe *orthodox* opi-" nions, at leaſt concerning the divinity of the Son " of God, which the Dr. has treated in ſo bold, as " well as ludicrous a manner; and had he lived *in* " *their days*, he muſt either have enlarged his *creed*,

" or

" or felt the *effects of their* HONEST RESENTMENT: " But tho' he has no right to *take ſhelter* under the " *merit* of thoſe good men—ſince he is departed from " that purity of faith, *whatever it was*, which they " profeſſed, as far as darkneſs is from light: Yet," &c. As this ſeemed to be one of the moſt labored paſſages in his libel, I was willing he ſhould have the credit of it, by quoting it thus at large. As to myſelf, I am at a loſs whether it moſt merits contempt or indignation, ridicule or grave cenſure. There may therefore, perhaps, be a mixture of them all in the following remarks upon it.

1. I have never been backward to own, that my religious ſentiments are, in ſome reſpects, different from thoſe of the generality of our forefathers. Much leſs did I ever *ſwear* to, *ſubſcribe*, or *profeſs* to believe all their opinions; ſo that, in this reſpect at leaſt, the epiſcopalian clergy cannot juſtly accuſe me of *hypocriſy*. Much leſs did I ever think of taking *ſhelter under the merit* of thoſe good men; never having imagined that I ſtood in need of any other *merits* beſides thoſe of my *Redeemer*. But,

2. The *Examiner* in this paſſage, ſo full of chriſtian *candor* and benevolence, has repreſented my religious ſentiments as much more different from thoſe of our good fathers, than they really are. Of this I am certainly a better judge than he can poſſibly be; ſince I beſt know what my own ſentiments are—" How *widely* he has departed from the faith which theſe good men profeſſed—" "—as far as *darkneſs* is from *light*—" " and that as to the *moſt eſſential* doctrines of chriſtianity—" What more could he have ſaid, if I had been a profeſſed Roman-catholic? I had almoſt ſaid, a Mahometan. Does this man, or do many others well conſider what they ſay, when they ſo freely charge others with denying the *eſſential* doctrines of the goſpel? Who told them that the doctrines which they often ſpeak thus of, even ſuppoſing them true, are *eſſential?* Is not this equivalent to ſaying, that the deniers of them are no chriſtians, tho' they profeſs a

ſincere

ſincere regard to Jeſus Chriſt as the Saviour of the world, and to the Holy Scriptures as a revelation from God? Do they conſider, that this judging and ſetting at nought their brethren, is expreſly prohibited by our common Lord? Do they conſider, that there are *hard ſpeeches* againſt men, as well as againſt God, that muſt hereafter be accounted for? I wiſh ſome people who may mean better, perhaps, than my *Examiner* does, would more ſeriouſly conſider the conſequences of talking at this rate, than they ſeem to do *. But,

3. There are ſome more *particular* inſinuations and aſſertions here, and in other parts of this defamatory pamphlet, in order to ſhew how *widely* I differ from our good forefathers. It is intimated that I am a *Socinian*: "Whatever their notions of liberty—amount-"ed to, they certainly had no great opinion of *the* "*learned Socinus.*" Here this *Cenſor* alludes to a paſſage in one of my ſermons on *Chriſtian Sobriety*, p. 57. in which I ſpeak of *Socinus* under that character, *learned*. Will this *candid* man then allow none to be even learned, unleſs they are *Athanaſians?* It were ſomewhat hard to deny them all, the reputation of learning in this world: Is it not enough for charitable and meek chriſtians ſolemnly to declare, that they ſhall *without doubt periſh everlaſtingly?* But the

* What our pious forefathers conſidered as the *moſt eſſential* branches of chriſtianity, may doubtleſs be learnt in part from the firſt *church covenant* uſed in the Maſſachuſetts-Bay colony; *viz.* at Salem, before the year 1630; and, I think, afterwards in other churches. This is preſerved in Dr. *Mather*'s hiſtory of New-England, B. I. ch. 4. Of which the Dr. ſays, "By this inſtrument was the *covenant of grace* explained, received and recognized, by the firſt church in this colony, and applied unto the *evangelical* deſigns of a *church ſtate*," &c. Now, if I were a friend to ſubſcriptions, I declare I could, with the utmoſt freedom, both with heart and hand, ſubſcribe this covenant; and even go farther towards what is uſually called *orthodoxy* among us. Let the reader then, who believes me *ſincere* in this proteſtation (as thoſe that know me beſt, will) judge whether I am juſtly accuſed of departing from the *moſt eſſential* doctrines of the goſpel, which our ſaid fathers held, "as far as darkneſs is from light!"—Happy had it probably been for New-England, if no narrower, or more diviſive *church covenants* had ever been ſeen among us.——

the *candor* of my *Examiner* is here the more obſervable, becauſe in the very paſſage where I ſpeak of *Socinus* as a learned man, I introduce him on purpoſe to intimate my *diſlike* of his moſt diſtinguiſhing opinions; as I did expreſly, without giving the leaſt intimation that I approved any one of them, as I never did. What if the reader ſhould here a little "indulge his aſtoniſhment" at the *candor* and *modeſty* of this man! To uſe his own language, could he write thus "without bluſhing?"—Truly, by the ſpirit that runs through his pamphlet, I almoſt believe *he could*; tho' it is probable, there are not many other perſons in the world, who have got ſo far beyond that *childiſh infirmity*.

He goes on—"They entertained thoſe *orthodox* opinions, at leaſt concerning the *divinity* of the Son of God, which the Dr. has treated in ſo bold as well as ludicrous a manner."—That I ever denied, or treated in a bold or ludicrous manner, the divinity of the Son of God, as revealed in Scripture, I abſolutely deny. My ſoul loves and adores him. Of his great ſalvation I have a good hope thro' grace; more prized by me than many, than all worlds: And I have made it my ſerious endeavour to preach his *unſearchable riches* according to the Scriptures of truth, without pretending to be wiſe above what is written. I have indeed expreſſed my diſbelief, and even contempt of certain metaphyſical and ſcholaſtic, unſcriptural and ridiculous definitions or explications of the *trinity*, which ſome men have given. This is all that he can make of thoſe places in my ſermons, to which he has had the aſſurance to refer the reader, without quoting a ſyllable of them. He hoped, no doubt, that his word would be taken, on account of the formality of a marginal reference. But in ſome of theſe very paſſages, the true ſcriptural account of Chriſt's divinity is aſſerted and proved.—But this is the practice of ſome men. With them, rejecting mere human inventions and refinements reſpecting the doctrines of Scripture, is the ſame thing with denying ſcripture-doctrines themſelves. And accordingly they ſcruple not

not boldly and plumply to tax others therewith, in general terms; and to treat them as hereticks, enemies to the *moſt eſſential* doctrines of the goſpel, &c. Let ſuch men remember, that that glorious Perſon for whoſe honour they either are, or would be thought to be concerned, has ſaid, "Judge not, that ye be "not judged."

But this is not the only ſpecimen which this writer has given of his *candor* towards me, with reſpect to doctrinal points. In his flaming apoſtrophe to the miniſters of Boſton, (who, as he was informed, had thanked me for the *Obſervations*) he accuſes me of "attempts to undermine the *fundamental* principles of their faith"—"thoſe *eſſential* doctrines"—"the doctrines of *grace*"—deſtroying the *fundamental* principles of their faith"—and "undermining the *dignity* and *divinity* of the Son of God."—All theſe railing accuſations are in page 77. In the next, I am ſaid to "deny and ridicule the doctrine of juſtification by faith;"—to "diſcard the notion of original ſin;"—and to "brand the notion of imputed righteouſneſs with the reproach of nonſenſe."—And he inſults the ſaid reverend gentlemen, as not having "the courage to riſe up in *defence of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and the truth of *his goſpel*," in oppoſition to me. Theſe heavy charges are in p. 78. Concerning all which, as they reſpect myſelf, I proteſt before God and the world, that they are abſolute *falſehoods*. Nor has he produced a ſingle ſentence from any of my writings, to ſupport any one of them; which, he knew, was not in his power. He has indeed had the confidence to refer in the margin, to ſome of my ſermons, to render his groundleſs accuſations the more plauſible; hoping his word would be taken. But whoever will be at the pains to turn to theſe paſſages, will find the whole amount of them to be this—that I explode certain wrong and unſcriptural explanations of thoſe doctrines; ſome of them tending to licentiouſneſs; while I not only allow, but aſſert and prove the doctrines, in a ſober, ſcriptural ſenſe. What an iniquitous artifice

is

is this, to bring ſuch general charges without quotations; and without making any diſtinction betwixt the doctrines of Scripture in general, and unſcriptural refinements upon them? I appeal to God and the world—nay, to the *conſcience* of this virulent accuſer himſelf, if it is not *ſuch* an one as we read of in one of St. Paul's epiſtles †.—

But he goes ſtill further; intimating his ſuſpicions that I am a *deiſt*, p. 79.—"The Dr.'s reflection upon the Song of Solomon is ſufficient to ſhow how eaſy it is for him to diſcard the *ſacred canon of ſcripture itſelf*: Or perhaps," &c. But he dared not to cite that *reflection*, as he calls it. The moſt that can be fairly and logically inferred from it, is, that I ſuppoſed there was *near* as much reaſon for admitting the *Wiſdom* as the *Song* of Solomon into the canon;—a very harmleſs ſuppoſition, even tho' it ſhould be a miſtake; and which does not imply the latter to be admitted without reaſon.—He had before intimated, p. 76, that there was ground to "ſuſpect that I deceive myſelf, when I profeſs a regard for—*divine revelation*"—Behold his *candor!* He alſo makes a great outcry, becauſe I ſomewhere ſaid, that certain paſſages of Scripture ſeemed "at firſt view" to countenance the doctrine of annihilation. "This," ſays he, "will be "greedily catched at by thoſe who have lived in ſuch "a manner, as to have no better hope in their death."—"This and ſeveral other paſſages—certainly have a threatning aſpect upon *the religion of Jeſus Chriſt.*" Now if I had any reaſon to think him ſincere in all this, I ſhould think myſelf bound as a chriſtian to give him a particular anſwer. At preſent I ſhall only obſerve, that if he had had enough of the charitable ſpirit of that religion, for which he expreſſes ſo great a concern; or if he had but duly meditated upon the eternity of thoſe *torments*, which he ſuppoſes ſtruck at by me, before he began to write; he would probably have ſpared ſome of his railing accuſations, and palpable falſehoods; and made that *candor* which he profeſſes,

† 1 Tim. iv. 2.

feſſes, a little more conſpicuous to his readers.—But to return to his 47th and 48th pages, to illuſtrate the ſpirit of which, I have made the laſt preceding remarks; I obſerve,

4. That he there intimates his ſuſpicions, that whatever eſteem and veneration I profeſſed for our good fathers, is "mere *grimace*, or rather a deſign calculated *ad captum vulgi*, to raiſe a ferment in the minds of the people," &c. But where is the *candor* of this? May I not conſiſtently have an high regard for their memory, tho' I do not in every reſpect embrace their opinions? I am certain I have; and it is in the nature of things impoſſible for him to know the contrary. Nay, does not he himſelf profeſs a great eſteem of them, notwithſtanding the wide difference betwixt them and him?—much wider, without doubt, than betwixt them and me. I ſhould not fear to lay myſelf under bonds in a conſiderable ſum, that this man, ſo full of *evil ſurmiſings* and *perverſe diſputings*, would be known to diſagree more with them, much more upon the whole, than I do, if he were not ſo very *modeſt* as to conceal his name—But who can blame a man for this precaution, if he writes in ſuch a manner as to expoſe himſelf to univerſal contempt, or indignation, if he were known?—

5. I am much miſtaken if this *candid* man, this enemy to religious *perſecution*, did not deſire ſomething farther than merely to render me odious, by one ſtroke in the aforeſaid paſſage. For immediately after repreſenting me as a *Socinian*, and one who had ridiculed the "deity of the Son of God," he ſays, that had I lived in the days of our pious fathers, I "muſt either have enlarged my *creed*, or felt the effects of their *honeſt reſentment*." Let the reader compare this with what he elſewhere ſays of my principles, particularly in his *fiery* addreſs to the miniſters of Boſton; and then judge whether it would fully *ſatisfy* this meek chriſtian, to have me univerſally *abhorred*.———

6. With how great advantage might I retort upon him a ſuſpicion, that whatever he has ſaid in honor

of

is this, to bring ſuch general charges without quotations; and without making any diſtinction betwixt the doctrines of Scripture in general, and unſcriptural refinements upon them? I appeal to God and the world—nay, to the *conſcience* of this virulent accuſer himſelf, if it is not *ſuch* an one as we read of in one of St. Paul's epiſtles †.—

But he goes ſtill further; intimating his ſuſpicions that I am a *deiſt*, p. 79.—"The Dr.'s reflection upon the Song of Solomon is ſufficient to ſhow how eaſy it is for him to diſcard the *ſacred canon of ſcripture itſelf*: Or perhaps," &c. But he dared not to cite that *reflection*, as he calls it. The moſt that can be fairly and logically inferred from it, is, that I ſuppoſed there was *near* as much reaſon for admitting the *Wiſdom* as the *Song* of Solomon into the canon;—a very harmleſs ſuppoſition, even tho' it ſhould be a miſtake; and which does not imply the latter to be admitted without reaſon.—He had before intimated, p. 76, that there was ground to "ſuſpect that I deceive myſelf, when I profeſs a regard for—*divine revelation*"—Behold his *candor!* He alſo makes a great outcry, becauſe I ſomewhere ſaid, that certain paſſages of Scripture ſeemed "at firſt view" to countenance the doctrine of annihilation. "This," ſays he, "will be "greedily catched at by thoſe who have lived in ſuch "a manner, as to have no better hope in their death." —"This and ſeveral other paſſages—certainly have a threatning aſpect upon *the religion of Jeſus Chriſt.*" Now if I had any reaſon to think him ſincere in all this, I ſhould think myſelf bound as a chriſtian to give him a particular anſwer. At preſent I ſhall only obſerve, that if he had had enough of the charitable ſpirit of that religion, for which he expreſſes ſo great a concern; or if he had but duly meditated upon the eternity of thoſe *torments*, which he ſuppoſes ſtruck at by me, before he began to write; he would probably have ſpared ſome of his railing accuſations, and palpable falſehoods; and made that *candor* which he profeſſes,

† 1 Tim. iv. 2.

feſſes, a little more conſpicuous to his readers.—But to return to his 47th and 48th pages, to illuſtrate the ſpirit of which, I have made the laſt preceding remarks; I obſerve,

4. That he there intimates his ſuſpicions, that whatever eſteem and veneration I profeſſed for our good fathers, is "mere *grimace*, or rather a deſign calculated *ad captum vulgi*, to raiſe a ferment in the minds of the people," &c. But where is the *candor* of this? May I not conſiſtently have an high regard for their memory, tho' I do not in every reſpect embrace their opinions? I am certain I have; and it is in the nature of things impoſſible for him to know the contrary. Nay, does not he himſelf profeſs a great eſteem of them, notwithſtanding the wide difference betwixt them and him?—much wider, without doubt, than betwixt them and me. I ſhould not fear to lay myſelf under bonds in a conſiderable ſum, that this man, ſo full of *evil ſurmiſings* and *perverſe diſputings*, would be known to diſagree more with them, much more upon the whole, than I do, if he were not ſo very *modeſt* as to conceal his name—But who can blame a man for this precaution, if he writes in ſuch a manner as to expoſe himſelf to univerſal contempt, or indignation, if he were known?—

5. I am much miſtaken if this *candid* man, this enemy to religious *perſecution*, did not deſire ſomething farther than merely to render me odious, by one ſtroke in the aforeſaid paſſage. For immediately after repreſenting me as a *Socinian*, and one who had ridiculed the "deity of the Son of God," he ſays, that had I lived in the days of our pious fathers, I "muſt either have enlarged my *creed*, or felt the effects of their *honeſt reſentment*." Let the reader compare this with what he elſewhere ſays of my principles, particularly in his *fiery* addreſs to the miniſters of Boſton; and then judge whether it would fully *ſatisfy* this meek chriſtian, to have me univerſally *abhorred*.———

6. With how great advantage might I retort upon him a ſuſpicion, that whatever he has ſaid in honor

of

of our fathers "is mere grimace,"—"a deſign calculated *ad captum vulgi*, to raiſe a ferment in the minds of the people, &c.?" For let the circumſtances be conſidered: I had written againſt the conduct of the *Society*, expreſſed my diſlike of *the church*, and my hopes that it would not prevail here. It alſo plainly appears, particularly by the furious apoſtrophe aforeſaid, that he was apprehenſive what I wrote, either had, or was likely to have ſome influence, in keeping people ſteady to their old congregational principles. Now, to take the *Examiner* in his own way, may it not be ſuſpected that all his pretenſions of reſpect to the memory of our fathers, are "mere grimace,—*ad captum vulgi*;" and *ad captum* of our magiſtrates and miniſters alſo, as well as of the common people? May it not be ſuſpected, that with the like pious and *eccleſiaſtical* deſign, he endeavours to raiſe an univerſal ferment and clamour againſt me as a Socinian or deiſt; a man who has departed as far from our fathers *pure faith*, "as darkneſs is from light," &c. &c.? What more likely method than this, to keep people from paying any regard to what I ſaid, or might ſay, reſpecting *the church?* And how much might it contribute to conciliate their affections to her, as their dear mother, to find one of her ſons ſpeaking ſo reſpectfully of their progenitors? What could have a more promiſing tendency to make them return into her boſom, than to ſow the ſeeds of greater diviſions and animoſities among us, particularly among *our miniſters*, than any that before ſubſiſted? What a glorious harveſt might *the church* expect to reap, could *they* be engaged in a public quarrel? Did we never hear of ſuch ingenuous arts as theſe? Is *Divide et impera*, a new maxim either in church or ſtate? Are there none of thoſe, whoſe buſineſs it is to "*catch men*," the moſt ſucceſsful *fiſhers* of them, when they fiſh in *troubled waters?*

I appeal to the diſcerning and impartial reader, whether the *Examiner*'s way of treating his ſubject, or rather of reviling me, as an enemy to the *moſt eſſential* doctrines of the goſpel, profeſſed by our fathers;

—his profeſſing ſuch a regard for them himſelf;—reproaching the Boſton miniſters for ſhewing their approbation of my *Obſervations*, while they had not the *courage*, as he ſays, "to riſe up in defence of the *Lord Jeſus Chriſt* and the *truth of his goſpel*," againſt me, &c. Whether all this, I ſay, does not ſufficiently diſcover the ſpirit of this man, and his deſigns, to be really ſuch as I ſuſpect them †.

The *Examiner*'s ſuggeſtions near the cloſe of his libel, that what I have written upon this occaſion will be attended with unfavourable "impreſſions, where it is the intereſt of the province to ſtand in a favourable light," are of a ſimilar nature; mere bugbears, to frighten children, or thoſe that know no more; and to be deſpiſed by all other perſons.—I am indeed heartily ſorry, that my writings firſt and laſt, on different ſubjects and occaſions, have been ſo little adapted to do honor to my native country. All I can ſay, is, that I have ever had her intereſt and reputation, her laws and liberties, her civil and religious rights, near my heart. This ſufficiently appears even from my mean writings; and I ſincerely congratulate, and rejoice with thoſe of my countrymen, whom God has endowed with abilities to accompliſh thoſe ends by their writings, which I have aimed at; however unſucceſsfully, yet with equal ſincerity and ardor.

I ſhall not imitate my *Examiner*, by an oſtentatious recapitulation of what has been done in this *Defence:* Nor ſhall I ſing any pœans, after the manner of Roman conquerors; eſpecially as my victory, if

† If the reverend miniſters of Boſton are ſuppoſed by any to have treated me with *too much candor and charity*; all I ſhall ſay at preſent upon that head, is, that it is in *my power* very fully to convince the world, that this is a *groundleſs ſuſpicion*—But I well know what ſome people deſire; and do not think it expedient to gratify them—"Latet anguis in herba"—My *Examiner* had doubtleſs a deſign to alarm the honoured and beloved people of my paſtoral charge, and to prejudice them againſt me. But they well know the falſhood, and perceive the malice of his accuſations: And from all that I know of them, or have perceived on this occaſion, his libel is likely to have an effect, in this reſpect, directly contrary to that which he hoped it would produce.

real, is ſo *inconſiderable* as not at all to deſerve the honor of a triumph! I have certainly overcome neither a BRENNUS nor ANTIOCHUS, neither an HANNIBAL nor a MYTHRIDATES.—The whole is, with great deference, ſubmitted to the judgment of the intelligent and unprejudiced reader. I can heartily join with the *Examiner* in the collect with which he concludes, "tho' in the words of the liturgy:" And ſhall take leave of him, by exhorting him, at once with proper reſentment and hearty good-will, ſeriouſly to reflect on the very unchriſtian manner in which he has treated me;—the many groſly falſe repreſentations in his pamphlet;—and, as he expects to appear before the awful tribunal of Jeſus Chriſt, to give me public and chriſtian ſatisfaction for theſe abuſes.

* * * * * * * *

P. S. It ſhould have been obſerved, p. 20. That whereas the *Examiner* ſays, there is no expreſs mention of *Indians*, but only of the king's *ſubjects*, in the *Society*'s charter; the Indians bordering on our colonies were actually conſidered, called, and treated with as *ſubjects*, before as well as ſince the ſaid charter was granted. Tho' if this had not been the caſe, yet they clearly come within the expreſs deſign of the inſtitution, by virtue of theſe words, "for propagating the goſpel *in thoſe parts*;" as was ſhewn before.

☞ There is a paſſage in the hiſtorical *account* of the *Society*, 1706. p. 10, 11. which appears to me very material in the queſtion about the *eſtabliſhments*. I will firſt produce it, and then make ſome ſhort remarks upon it. After ſpeaking of New-England as firſt planted and inhabited by people, many of whom had taken *refuge* there "on account of their ſuffering for nonconformity at home," the *Society* go on thus: "So that they "fell there generally into independent congregations: "till about the year 1679, when *upon queſtioning the* "*charter* of that country, the Lord biſhop of London, "upon an addreſs from ſeveral of the inhabitants of "Boſton, did *prevail with his Majeſty*, [Charles II.] "*that a church ſhould be* ALLOWED in that town, for "the

"the exerciſe of religion according to the church of "England."—

1. The time here referred to, 1679. was *poſterior* to all the ſtatutes alledged for the eſtabliſhment of the church of England here, except thoſe of the 5th of Q. *Anne*, ch. 5 and 8.

2. It appears from hence, that even the biſhop of London and the *Society* did not ſuppoſe the ſaid church eſtabliſh'd here, at the time aforeſaid. For had this been ſuppoſed, what occaſion was there for his Lordſhip to intercede with his Majeſty to *allow* a church in Boſton, *for the exerciſe of religion?* &c.

3. By this manner of expreſſion, it ſeems that it was thought even in thoſe times, a ſtretch of *prerogative* for the king to *allow*, &c. tho' he was *prevailed* with to do it. It ſeems as if this allowance was *hardly* conſiſtent with the charter and laws of this country; ſo that recourſe was had to a *diſpenſing power* in the crown, often claimed and exerciſed in thoſe times, with reference to corporations, &c.

4. This conjecture is rendered the more probable, becauſe it is particularly remarked in the paſſage before cited, that it was "upon queſtioning the charter" of this country, that the ſaid *allowance* was ſolicited and obtained.

5. If the church of England was not here eſtabliſhed at that time, but was then introduced and *tolerated*, in conſequence of the king's exerciſing a power at leaſt *dubious*, and, in effect, annulling our charter and laws; it is plain that the eſtabliſhment of ſaid church here, depends and reſts ſolely on the two ſtatutes aforeſaid, A. 5. ch. 5 and 8. How precarious and ſlender a foundation this is, needs not be repeated.

☞ Nothing here ſaid, is to be underſtood as if I liked thoſe ancient laws of theſe colonies, which bore hard on the members of the church of England: It is my opinion, that they were unjuſtifiable; and I am ſincerely glad that they are no longer in force. All thoſe which we now have, relating to religion, are in fact the *King's laws*, who is head of the church of England;—as truly and properly *his*, perhaps, as thoſe laws by which the church of England itſelf is eſtabliſh'd in England.

SECTION XII.

REMARKS *on a rambling, abuſive* LETTER *annexed to the* UN-CANDID Examination *aforeſaid, and erroneouſly called* A SHORT VINDICATION of the Society. *By one of its Members* *.

THO' the author of this letter ſtiles himſelf a Member of the Society; yet as he chuſes, not without good reaſon, to conceal his name, no one is bound to believe him. However, to me this is a matter of indifference; I ſhall not therefore diſpute that point with him. His letter is not the better in itſelf, tho' written by a Member of the Society, nor the worſe, if written by ſome other perſon. It bears the marks of age, with its uſual infirmities, whoever was the author of it.

I cannot but obſerve, in the firſt place, That there is not a ſingle authority, citation or voucher produced thro' the whole; tho' this was apparently neceſſary in order to confute me, who had produced ſo many; and to vindicate the *Society*. It conſiſts chiefly of looſe declamation, and vague aſſertions, which reſt ſolely on the credit of this *Somebody*, *Nobody* can tell who. And if the great *difficulty* which he "labor'd under in writing," is a ſufficient apology for his neglect in this reſpect, it might have equally excuſed him in not writing at all.—This, to be ſure, is a pleaſant way of writing *anſwers* and *vindications*. Why did he not, as he might with equal propriety, ſum all up in one ſingle

* The author had prepared a more particular reply to this *Letter*. But on farther conſideration of the *Letter* itſelf, and hearing the opinion of others concerning it, he thought there was no need of a *beetle* upon this occaſion. He therefore contracted what he had written; and the rather, becauſe the preceding *Defence* was ſo large and particular, as, if he is not miſtaken, to render *any* reply to this looſe, declamatory performance in a manner unneceſſary.

ſingle poſitive aſſertion, That my *Obſervations* were unjuſt, and that the *Society* had certainly done right? This would have been as convincing as all that he has written; and would alſo have ſaved both precious time, and paper.

The politeneſs of this writer (or ſhall I rather ſay, his *candor?)* is ſufficiently diſcovered in his firſt paragraph (p. 81.) He ſays, with an air of aſſurance, that my obſervations and reflections are "either merely "*perſonal*, or *ludicrous*, and often *trifling*, and *few* "of them relating to the *merits* of the cauſe; which "is a practice quite unbecoming a *juſt writer*, either "in the critical or moral ſenſe of that character." A very decent and modeſt beginning, without doubt. He proceeds in the ſame page: "There is one *grand* "*impoſition* upon his readers, which runs thro' the "*whole*, and which is, as it were, the burden of his "ſong, *in which there is not the leaſt truth.*"—Very civil and modeſt again. Unleſs he can make good this high charge, the reader will conſider what opinion I have a right to entertain, not only of his breeding, but of his veracity and morals. The pretended *impoſition* is this—"That the *chief* view and endeavour of "the *Society* has been to convert preſbyterians and "congregationaliſts to the church, to the neglect of "Negroes and Indians, and the *heatheniſh* colonies, "as he calls them." He immediately adds, "If "ever their miſſionaries had done this"—Done what, good Sir? You was ſpeaking of the *chief* view and endeavour of the *Society*, not of what their miſſionaries have, or have not done.—But I will conſider the writer's age.—After paſſing ſome harſh and coarſe cenſures upon the "diſſenters from the beginning," as promoters of "faction," &c. which, he ſays, "iſſued "in right down rebellion," he adds, "It is true, "every good churchman muſt rejoice, when any of "our *wandering brethren*—return to the unity of the "church.—But as the *Society was not incorporated for* "*that purpoſe*, nor was it ever their principal aim, I "believe very few inſtances, if any, can be produced,

" of any miſſionaries beginning with any diſſenter, " with a view of *reclaiming* him to the church. I have " been *long* knowing to the affairs of the *Society*, and " know of no ſuch inſtances," p. 82. This is his proof of the *grand impoſition* aforeſaid. Upon which I obſerve,

That he has not ſhewn that I even inadvertently expreſſed myſelf, as if this was the " *chief* view and endeavour of the *Society*." I very explicitly ſaid the direct contrary; with a formal deſign to guard againſt any ſuch conſtruction, and to do juſtice and honor to the *Society*. For the 6th ſection of the *Obſervations* begins thus: " That the *Society* have *chiefly* ſent their " miſſionaries into thoſe Britiſh plantations where they " were *much needed*, *according to the true deſign of their* " *inſtitution*; and that they have hereby ſerved the " intereſt of religion in them, is by *no means* to be " denied: It were very *criminal* to deny them the " praiſe that is juſtly due to them in this reſpect. But, " that they have deviated from their original plan— " in *ſome other* reſpects; and thereby left undone " much of the good which they might probably have " effected," &c. Let the *Vindicator* compare this with his heavy charge againſt me, as to the *grand impoſition* which, he ſays, runs through my *whole* performance, ſo as to be the *burden of my ſong*. And when he has made this compariſon, taking it for granted at preſent, that he is an *aged* member of the *Society*, I will only requeſt him to lay his hand upon his heart, and ſeriouſly conſider, whether ſuch a groundleſs accuſation is a branch of that *righteouſneſs*, which adds a luſtre and glory to the " hoary head." But

Tho' this aged member " knows of no ſuch in- " ſtances" as he ſpeaks of; yet, that the *Society* have actually had it *partly* in their view to convert preſbyterians, &c. is evident beyond diſpute, even from one of their ſtanding *Inſtructions* to their miſſionaries. It runs thus: ' That they *frequently viſit* their reſpective " pariſhioners; thoſe of our *own* communion, to keep " them ſteady in the profeſſion and practice of reli- " gion,

" gion, as taught in the church of England; thoſe " that *oppoſe* us, or *diſſent* from us, to *convince* and " *reclaim* them with a ſpirit of meekneſs and gentle- " neſs." Now, is it not ſtrange that this gentleman, who has been ſo " long knowing to the affairs of the " *Society*," as to have *known Dr. Bray, the Father of it, very well*, (p. 82.) ſhould remember nothing of this *Inſtruction*, publiſhed ſo long ago as the year 1706, and ſtill continued!—Or was this his meaning, That tho' he knew of this *Inſtruction*, yet he did not know of any miſſionary who had been *faithful to his truſt*, by acting in conformity to it?

But that ſome of the miſſionaries have not been ſo negligent in this reſpect, as he ſuppoſes, is well known to many among us. It were eaſy to give numerous inſtances of their zeal and activity in *edifying the church of England*, by bringing in preſbyterians, &c. At preſent one example ſhall ſuffice. It is the famous caſe of Mr. Commiſſary PRICE, who ſome time ago reſided at Hopkinton, about 30 miles from Boſton. Having a *farm* or two there, he uſed his endeavours to bring over the congregationaliſts to the church, from their Reverend Paſtor, Mr. SAMUEL BARRETT, an aged gentleman now living. The ſaid Mr. PRICE drew up a petition to the *Society* for a miſſionary, in behalf of ſome epiſcopalians in ſaid town, to which he got as many names ſubſcribed as poſſible. In this petition great encomiums are beſtowed on the Reverend *Draughts-man*; and the *Society* are earneſtly ſolicited to fix him as a miſſionary at Hopkinton.

There have been few more flagrant inſtances of eccleſiaſtical juggling than this of the Commiſſary. It was laid open by the Reverend Mr. BARRETT aforeſaid, in a letter to Sir HENRY NEWMAN, whom, by miſtake, he then ſuppoſed Secretary to the *Society*. This letter is written in a very plain, ſenſible and candid manner: It recites the aforeſaid petition at large, and contains remarks upon it. And as it may ſerve not only to convince this *Vindicator*, but to throw light upon and confirm what was ſaid in the *Obſervations*,

concerning the methods uſed to propagate the church of England among us; I ſhall give it to the reader at large in the margin; only premiſing, that I had it from Mr. BARRETT himſelf, in his own hand-writing, with expreſs leave to publiſh it as his *.

It

* The Rev. Mr. *Barrett*'s letter to Sir *H. Newman*, then ſuppoſed by him to be Secretary to the *Society*.

Boſton, March 15, 1738.

SIR,

I Underſtand that a petition hath lately been ſent to the Honourable Society for propagating the goſpel, ſubſcribed by ſundry of the inhabitants of Hopkinton *and others*, requeſting the ſaid Honourable Society to ſend them an Epiſcopal Miniſter, and aſſiſt them in his ſupport and maintenance. And by your known character as a zealous friend to truth, peace and righteouſneſs, and your relation to ſaid Honourable Society, I have been induced to give you the trouble of this letter; hoping it will not be too late to ſet that matter in a true light, and thereby to hinder the excellent charity of pious perſons being unhappily miſapplied upon this occaſion.

The petition to which I refer, is as followeth, *taken from the original draught under the Rev. Mr. Commiſſary* Price's *own hand-writing.*

" May it pleaſe the Honourable Board,

" We the Subſcribers are members of the church of England, many of us by education, and others by conviction, and by an impartial inquiry after truth: But ſuch is our misfortune, to be ſettled in a part of this province, where we are deſtitute of the invaluable bleſſings of the public worſhip of God, agreeable to our principles, and the practice of the *true Church of England*; many of us having newly entred upon our farms, and conſequently not able to ſupport a miniſter ourſelves, and at too great a diſtance from any epiſcopal church, to receive the benefit of the publick ordinances; thirty miles being the neareſt. So that were it not for the kind aſſiſtance of the Rev. Mr. Commiſſary *Price*, who once a month viſits, and performs divine ſervice among us, we ſhould be utterly deprived of all regular and public worſhip, and ourſelves and families *in danger of falling into the deplorable ignorance of the native Indians.* In theſe our miſerable circumſtances to whom ſhould we apply (next to God) but to that pious and charitable Society which has undertaken to relieve the *diſtreſſed*, and by whoſe generous endeavours we daily ſee chriſtianity thrive and flouriſh among us? We humbly hope the neceſſitous condition of no inconſiderable number, as we and our families are in the town of Hopkinton, and the places adjacent, will move your compaſſion towards us, and powerfully plead for a ſhare of that bounty, which our brethren of the ſame communion in other parts enjoy, and are happy in. And we ſhall

not

It appears then, that ſome perſons know that the miſſionaries have not been quite ſo *negligent* of their *Inſtruc-*

not fail to expreſs our gratitude, and endeavour to deſerve it, by contributing to the utmoſt of our ability towards the ſupport and comfort of any miniſter that the Society ſhall ſee meet to ſend among us; which, we engage, ſhall not be leſs than ſixty pounds per annum of this currency; and will enlarge the ſum in proportion to the encreaſe of our eſtates. But if we may preſume further to ſpeak our deſires, we ſhould be doubly thankful if we could in any degree be under the care of the Rev. Gentleman before mentioned, *to whoſe unwearied labours we owe our increaſe, and hopeful ſituation.* There is a good farm conſiſting of upwards of fifty acres, with an houſe and barn and ſtock of cattle upon it, appropriated to the uſe of an epiſcopal miniſter for ever: Which, after a few years, by the care of an incumbent, and the aſſiſtance we ſhall be willing to afford him in improving it, will be a comfortable ſupport to him. But at preſent we are *as great objects of the Society's compaſſion as any of our brethren of the epiſcopal church in New England*; and we promiſe ourſelves as happy ſucceſs from it, and ſhall as thankfully receive any tokens of it."

Upon which I would make the following remarks.

In the firſt place: Whereas the ſubſcribers declare themſelves members of the church of England, by education or conviction, and an impartial enquiry after truth; it is certain that, before the petition was ſent, the Rev. Mr. *Price* knew perfectly well that ſeveral of the ſubſcribers *never pretended to be churchmen*; nor did he ever examine them concerning their principles in this reſpect, as they have ſince declared. One of them has told me, that Mr. *Price* urged him to ſign it, ſaying it would do him no hurt. Another aſſured me that he was uneaſy about his ſigning; who apply'd himſelf to Mr. *Price*, who told him, his ſigning would not oblige him to pay towards the maintenance of the church of England. 'Tis known that ſome who were drawn into the ſubſcription, are profeſſed preſbyterians. It can be proved that one of theſe, being aſked how he who had been bred up in the preſbyterian way, could conform to the church, anſwered, that he was not a churchman; but that Mr. *Price obliged him to go to church or leave his place*; and ſaid further, that he intended to leave Mr. *Price*'s farm as ſoon as he could provide for himſelf; and then, he hoped, he ſhould enjoy *his own principles.* Another of the ſubſcribers aſſured me, that he was ſtill of the preſbyterian principles; but that Mr. *Price, his landlord, obliged him to go to church.* And, that all the ſubſcribers were not members of the church of England, by education or conviction, appears by a declaration (the original of which I have in my own hands) ſigned as followeth——"We the ſubſcribers, being among the number of ſundry of the inhabitants of Hopkinton, and others, who have petitioned the honourable Society for propagating the goſpel, to ſend them an epiſcopal miniſter; think ourſelves obliged to declare to the world, that although we are repreſented in ſaid petition

Inſtructions, as this aged member, and perhaps miſſionary of the *Society*, ſuppoſes. But whether the Rev.

petition as members of the church of England *(which we were ignorant of at the time of our ſigning)* yet we never pretended to be members of the church of England, or inclined to it, but were *urged* to ſign and petition, by the promoters of it; being told by them, that our ſigning was only in order to their having a miniſter who were churchmen, and that our ſigning would not make us churchmen; but that they muſt have ſuch a number of ſigners, or they could not have a miniſter ſent among them.

SAMUEL PECK,
ALEXANDER KELLEY,
JOSEPH WHITHERBY,
PETER BARNS."

In the next place, the honourable Society will be impoſed upon by Mr. Commiſſary's petition, if they think that the ſubſcribers are generally the owners of farms, and maſters of families in or near Hopkinton. Of all the ſubſcribers that are churchmen, by education or otherwiſe, I challenge him to produce more than *three* who have entred upon their own farms: The reſt are tenants, and many of them tenants at will; and who will ſucceed them is uncertain. Some of the ſubſcribers are not heads of families, but ſingle perſons not at their own diſpoſal; being not all of age to act for themſelves. Nor can it be ſaid with truth, that all the ſubſcribers are ſettled in a part of the province, where they are deſtitute of the worſhip of God according to the practice of the church of England, and thirty miles diſtant from it, at Hopkinton and the places adjacent; as ſeems plainly to be inſinuated. For, to make up a number of ſubſcribers ſufficient to obtain a miniſter from the Society, Mr. *Price* and the other promoters of this matter, have not only perſuaded ſundry perſons inconſiderately to ſign the petition, without knowing the contents of it, and to declare themſelves members of the church of England, when they are not ſo; but likewiſe among the number of thoſe whoſe families are diſtreſſed, have brought in landlords as well as tenants—landlords who have their dwellings in or near Boſton, where they may have their *choice* of epiſcopal miniſters. Nor can I forbear taking notice of the artful manner in which Mr. Commiſſary hath drawn his petition; he forbearing to give the leaſt hint, that there hath been, for this fourteen years, a congregational church ſettled in Hopkinton, which holds faſt the profeſſion of *the ſame faith that is contained in the doctrinal articles of the church of England*, and which have expreſſed their charity, by publickly declaring their readineſs to embrace the ſober, religious members of the church of England, who deſire and ſeek communion with them; and in which ſome of the members of Mr. *Price*'s own church have been admitted to communion, in the ordinance of baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper. But, inſtead of the leaſt intimation of this, Mr. Commiſſary has draughted the petition

Rev. Commiſſary's conduct, as repreſented below, was agreeable to the latter part of the *Inſtruction* aforeſaid, may

tition ſo as to inſinuate to the honourable Society, that the petitioners were ſettled upon a new tract of land, bordering upon *the natives*, where they might be ſerviceable to propagate the goſpel among *them:* What elſe can be the meaning of thoſe words in the petition?—*That without the kind aſſiſtance of the Rev. Mr. Commiſſary* Price, *who once a month viſits and performs divine ſervice among us, we ſhould be in danger of falling into the deplorable ignorance of the native Indians.* As to Mr. Commiſſary's uncharitableneſs towards the churches of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in this land, which he hath manifeſted in comparing their ſtate with that of the native *Indians*, I leave him to his own reflections upon it: But I muſt profeſs ſo much charity for the ſober members of the church of England, that I can't at preſent believe he will have many of his own communion to join with him in it.

I ſhall omit ſeveral remarks upon other exceptionable matters in ſaid Commiſſary's petition; and ſhall leave it to you and others, who may be acquainted with this affair, to make what reflections you think proper upon the conduct of this Rev. Gentleman and others, who have been *taking this method to expreſs their zeal for the church of England.* But who can think that ſuch methods to introduce the church of England among us, will be likely to conciliate the reſpect that her friends wiſh to ſee paid her by diſſenters? —Can ſuch management, to promote *uniformity in rituals and circumſtantials*, be thought ſerviceable to promote religion in general? —Hath it not rather a direct tendency to widen the diſtance between chriſtian brethren, and ſo obſtruct the exerciſe of that brotherly kindneſs and charity, without which we cannot adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour?

Thus, honoured Sir, I have written to you upon this occaſion, without the leaſt deſign to *give offence* to any members of the epiſcopal church; but from a real deſire to have peace with truth and holineſs eſtabliſhed and promoted among chriſtians; not doubting but you will take all in good part. I leave it with you to make that uſe of this letter which you think will tend moſt to anſwer this great and noble end; wiſhing you may be long continued a uſeful inſtrument in the hands of our Saviour, for promoting vital chriſtianity in the world. I am, Sir,

Your humble ſervant,

SAMUEL BARRETT,

Paſtor of the church of Chriſt in Hopkinton.

It will not be amiſs to ſubjoin to the preceding letter, the *depoſition* following, *viz.*

"We the ſubſcribers being among the number of ſome of the inhabitants of Hopkinton, *and others*, who have petition'd the Hon. *Society* for propagating the goſpel, to ſend them an epiſcopal miniſter.

may indeed be doubted: Which directs the miſſionaries, in frequently viſiting thoſe that *diſſent* from the church,

ſter, and to aſſiſt them in his maintenance; Now whereas it is ſet forth in ſaid petition, That the ſigners of it have engaged to give ſixty pounds per annum of this currency to any miniſter that the *Society* ſhould ſee meet to ſend among them, we do declare that we never read the contents of ſaid petition, nor did we ever underſtand that there was any obligation on the ſigners to pay the ſaid ſum, or any other ſum, towards the maintenance of the miniſter applied for to the *Society*.

Middleſex, ſcil. Hopkinton, June 15, 1741. The within named Alexander Kelley, &c. all perſonally appeared, and, after due caution, made oath to the truth of the above written, before me,

ALEX. KELLEY
SIMPSON JONES
Mark
JOHN + VICKLEY
his
PETER BARNES
THOMAS EDSAR.

JOHN JONES, *Juſt. Pacis.*"

This is a ſpecimen of that *myſtery of churchiſm*, which has long *worked* in N. England; other examples of it having been before given in the *Obſervations*. The aforeſaid letter was actually communicated by Sir *H. Newman* to the then Biſhop of London (I ſuppoſe Dr. *Gibſon*, author of the famous *Codex*.) That it was thus communicated by him, appears from his letter to Dr. *Colman* ſoon after; —an extract of which I had from Mr. *Barrett*, as follows—"I re- "ceived your's of the 17th of March, 1738-9, incloſing one from "Mr. *Barrett* of the 15th of the ſame month; *both which* I ſent to "the Biſhop of London, and had his Lordſhip's anſwer, May 17, "1739."—Dr. *Gibſon* having been, as is ſaid, a relation of Mr. Commiſſary *Price*, he might poſſibly decline laying this matter before the *Society*; even though Mr. *Barrett* took the precaution, as he told me, to have his name, place of abode, and character certified by a *Notary Public*. But whether the *Society* were let into this affair or not, the Rev. Commiſſary obtained his end, by being ſoon after fixed as a miſſionary in Hopkinton; where he continued till, as is ſaid, he was invited to England by the proſpect of greater *ſecular advantages* than he had here.——Now, it being the buſineſs of a Commiſſary to be at once an example and a check to the inferior clergy, and to keep them in ſome order; it muſt be ſuppoſed that he is commonly a perſon of at leaſt as much diſcretion, piety and integrity as any of them. What managements then, may it be naturally ſuppoſed, have they not been chargeable with, in order to build up *the church* here, when even their Commiſſary would *ſteal* and *impreſs* men for the ſervice of the church, in the manner before repreſented? We may, on this occaſion, invert thoſe words of the poet,

"Quid *domini* facient, audent cum talia *fures!*"

What will not *inferiors* do, when their *ſuperiors* are not aſhamed of ſuch diſhonourable practices!—

church, " to convince and reclaim them *with the ſpi-*
" *rit of meekneſs and gentleneſs.*"

It is in my power, upon a proper occaſion, to give other examples of their *fidelity* in this reſpect; and, perhaps, not much leſs to their honor, and the credit of the *Society* or *the church*, than the aforeſaid conduct of the Rev. Commiſſary: This may *ſatisfy* for the preſent. But if I rightly underſtand the *Vindicator*, he has, by a conceſſion in the paſſage above cited, gone far towards giving up the point in controverſy. He there allows, that " the *Society* was not incorpo-
" rated for *that purpoſe*;" viz. reconciling their *wandering*, *factious*, *ſchiſmatical* brethren *(diſſenters)* to the church of England. For if they were not incorporated for *that purpoſe*, does it not follow, that ſo far as they have uſed their endeavours, and expended their money in order to accompliſh this end, they have actually deviated from the deſign of their inſtitution? And whether this has not been a great object, both with the *Society* and their miſſionaries, is humbly ſubmitted, upon the evidence that has been produced here, and in the *Obſervations*.

It may not be amiſs, in the next place, to take ſome notice of what he ſays of Dr. BRAY's teſtimony, before produced by me; *viz.* That in Connecticut and the Maſſachuſetts, there was no occaſion " at all" for miſſionaries to propagate chriſtianity. The *Vindicator* ſays, " I agree to his report *at that time.*"—He afterwards intimates, that circumſtances were ſo altered, that there has been, and is great occaſion for miſſionaries *ſince*. Let him inform us what this alteration is.—" There was then," ſays he, " (except at Boſton)
" but here and there a member of the church of Eng-
" land ſcattered about theſe provinces.—But does it
" at all follow, that when there came to be ſuch num-
" bers of *conſcientious* members of the church of Eng-
" land—that the *Society* had by their charter no right
" and buſineſs to aſſiſt in providing for them?"—&c. p. 83. Now according to this reaſoning, tho' there was no occaſion *at all* for miſſionaries here, while the

people were all in a manner nonconformiſts; yet when churchmen became conſiderably numerous here, miſſionaries were much needed to chriſtianize them, or "to propagate chriſtianity" among them: (Which, as before obſerved, is Dr. BRAY's expreſſion.) But why it ſhould be ſo, I cannot eaſily ſee, unleſs people do in ſome ſort ceaſe to be chriſtians when they become churchmen; which I am very unwilling to ſuppoſe.—As to what is ſaid immediately after, about the propriety of the Society's providing miniſters for theſe conſcientious people, who may diſlike our way of worſhip; I need now add nothing upon this head, to what was ſaid in the *Obſervations*, Sect. X. intitled, *The plea of Conſcience*, &c. p. 64.

His next labor is to ſhew, from p. 83 to 86. what the increaſe of the church of England in theſe parts is owing to. In which he is partly right, and partly wrong. But as in all this he has not directly contradicted any thing ſaid by me, and as this does not immediately touch the merits of the cauſe, I ſhall let his miſtakes upon this head paſs uncorrected. Only I muſt obſerve, that as I never undertook to ſhew what were all, or even the principal occaſions of the growth of the church of England here, he has paſſed a very injurious and ungentleman-like reflection upon me, with reference to this matter——"Now," ſays he, "theſe "are all known facts: Is not Dr. Mayhew then very "*diſingenuous* to *conceal* them?"—&c. p. 86. If I had undertaken to aſſign *all* the cauſes, &c. he might have had ſome color for this baſe inſinuation. But the reader is left to judge, who is the moſt *diſingenuous*, I, for not mentioning what did not particularly affect the argument, (which he calls *concealing* it) or he for doing ſo, and then repreſenting me as diſingenuous, only becauſe I was not *impertinent*; as I ſhould alſo now be, if I gave a more particular anſwer to this part of *his* performance.

As to what he ſays in the ſame page; that "great advantages" have been derived from the prevalence of the church of England here, I ſhall only beg leave

to

to refer the reader to what was ſaid in the *Obſervations*, Sect. XI and XII. in anſwer to Mr. APTHORP upon this head.——In the ſame page he gives another ſpecimen of his politeneſs and breeding:—"If it was not "for now and then ſuch abuſive and uncharitable "*ſcribblings* of a few zealots, we ſhould ſoon coaleſce," &c. Thoſe who are not under very great prejudices, will, I believe, hardly agree with this gentleman, on *what ſide* there have been the moſt *abuſive* and *uncharitable ſcribblings*, in our diſputes with the epiſcopalians, and particularly in the preſent controverſy. And whether this aged member of the Society, who ſpeaks of the nonconformiſts from the beginning, as factious, rebellious ſectaries, and gravely taxes others with *uncharitable ſcribblings*, has himſelf written in ſuch a manner as to give others a good example, ſo that we may learn decency, good manners or charity from his *Vindication*, is ſubmitted to the judgment of his readers.

In ſome following pages he declaims about the excellency of epiſcopacy, the liturgy and church of England; about liberty of conſcience, &c. and endeavours to be, in his old age, what ſome may perhaps think was hardly in his power, even in youth;—to be *very witty*. All this I paſs over, as being——what it is.

After having got almoſt thro' his letter, in the manner before repreſented, he comes a little cloſer to the point in hand, p. 90. "But," ſays he, "the Dr. "inſiſts that Maſſachuſetts and Connecticut come "not within the Society's limits by the charter:" [I did not ſay ſo abſolutely, but excepted ſuch parts even of theſe colonies, in which there might be either no proteſtant miniſters, or miniſters but very meanly provided for.] "I anſwer, this cannot be maintained, "ſince they are not excepted by the charter, *unleſs it* "*can be proved* that the congregations of the church, "for which the *Society* provides in thoſe colonies, "would not in the ſenſe and words of the charter, "*want*, or be deſtitute of *the adminiſtration of God's*

"*word*

" *word and ſacraments*, if the Society did not aſſiſt " them: But this he does not, nor can he prove. " Surely he cannot pretend that K. WM. who in- " troduced the toleration of *diſſenters*, would leave " his *loving ſubjects of the church* UNTOLERATED, and " under the neceſſity of receiving God's word and ſa- " craments contrary to their conſciences, or of hav- " ing none.—It muſt therefore be his meaning to " provide that his *loving ſubjects of the church* might " enjoy God's word and ſacraments in theſe colo- " nies," &c.

This paſſage having more of the *form* and *air* of an argument than any other in the letter, ſhall be impartially, tho' briefly examined. And,

1. Here is a plain conceſſion, that theſe colonies *do not* come within the limits of the *Society*'s charter, if it can be proved that the epiſcopalians in them would not be deſtitute of the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments, in the ſenſe of the charter, altho' they were not provided for by the *Society*. On which ſuppoſition it will clearly follow, that whatever has been expended for them, has been miſapplied, i. e. applied in a way not warranted by the charter.

2. That clauſe [*in the ſenſe and words of the charter*] by which the *Vindicator* would ſome way qualify or reſtrain the general expreſſion in the charter, *want*, or *be deſtitute of the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments*, will not anſwer his end, unleſs he can prove that the royal Grantor uſed this latter expreſſion in ſome *peculiar*, *appropriate* ſenſe, not known and allowed by *proteſtants* in general, of different denominations: Or, in other words,—that he meant thereby, the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments according to the *particular* uſage of the church of England, not only in oppoſition to that of the church of Rome, but of Scotland, Holland, Geneva, and other proteſtant churches in general. If he underſtood it in any leſs appropriate ſenſe, or in the ſenſe common among *proteſtants*, the *Vindicator* can deduce no concluſion herefrom, that will be to his advantage.

3. That

3. That the charter uſes the aforeſaid expreſſion in any ſuch peculiar and appropriate ſenſe, does not appear. Or, to uſe his own words, "This he does not, nor can he prove." On the contrary it appears from the charter, that this expreſſion was uſed in the common, known and general ſenſe of proteſtants. Becauſe the evils propoſed to be remedied or guarded againſt, by having *orthodox miniſters* provided, are not preſbyterianiſm, congregationaliſm, lutheraniſm, or any particular form of proteſtantiſm, though different from the church of England; but atheiſm, infidelity, and the groſs errors of popery. What was wanted and propoſed, was, miniſters to inſtruct the people "in the principles of true religion" in general, conſidered only in oppoſition to ſuch fatal errors as theſe; or "in the chriſtian religion," as it is afterwards expreſſed. All which clearly ſhews, that the aforeſaid expreſſion was uſed in a catholic ſenſe, not in that narrow, limited one, which the *Vindicator* contends for.

4. What he alledges in ſupport of this ſenſe, will not endure any teſt at all, much leſs a rigorous and ſevere one. For what tho' King WILLIAM, who *tolerated* his *loving* nonconforming ſubjects, cannot be ſuppoſed to have left his ſubjects of the church of England *untolerated*; how does it appear from hence, that he uſed the expreſſion aforeſaid in ſuch a ſenſe as to imply, that other proteſtants, beſides thoſe of the church of England, do *not* enjoy the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments? It is this only, that can ſerve his turn, or be to his purpoſe. The toleration has really nothing to do in the preſent controverſy, any farther than this, that it ought to be ſuppoſed, or taken for granted. Or if it has any thing farther to do therewith, it may be improved with advantage in favor of the catholic ſenſe aforeſaid, in oppoſition to the *Vindicator*'s. For if all proteſtants in general were tolerated, and ſo far countenanced by the government, there is plainly leſs ground for him thus to reſtrict the ſenſe of that expreſſion, than there would be, if all beſides epiſcopalians were untolerated.

5. What then can be a more manifeſt inconſequence than this, that becauſe nonconformiſts are tolerated, therefore it was King WILLIAM's "meaning to provide, that his loving ſubjects of the church "might enjoy God's word and ſacraments in theſe "colonies?" &c.—That is, to *make proviſion* by the charter, for ſupporting that particular form of worſhip, in places where God's public worſhip was already provided for by other means, and in a different form, tho' as truly proteſtant.

6. Whereas the *Vindicator* ſeems to lay a mighty ſtreſs upon this dilemma, or alternative, that the epiſcopalians among us, unleſs the Society provided for them, would be "under the neceſſity of receiving "God's word and ſacraments contrary to their conſciences, or of having none," as he *accurately* expreſſes it; I anſwer, That tho' this, if true, may be juſtly conſidered as a great infelicity, yet it will never prove, that this particular proviſion was deſigned for *them*. Nay, for any thing that appears at preſent, the King's *living* preſbyterian or congregational ſubjects, living in another colony, where they labored under a ſimilar inconvenience, might near as plauſibly argue, That the good King WILLIAM, who was no bigot, and had a paternal regard for all his proteſtant ſubjects, tho' not of the church of England, undoubtedly deſigned that perſons in their unhappy ſituation ſhould be relieved and aſſiſted by this charity; leſt they ſhould be under a neceſſity, either of communicating with the church of England contrary to their conſciences, or elſe not enjoy God's word and ſacraments at all.—[But let me juſt add here, That it is notorious, the *Society* have long ſupported miſſions in New-England, in places where the epiſcopalians were not in fact reduced to ſuch a dilemma; being ſufficiently numerous and wealthy to ſupport their own miniſters.]

Whether theſe remarks do, or do not ſufficiently ſhew the invalidity of the *Vindicator*'s reaſoning, is ſubmitted to the intelligent reader. To give my ſenſe of

this diſpute in a few words—Whoever would fairly vindicate the *Society*'s conduct, muſt, I humbly conceive, not only prove that the mode of worſhip and diſcipline generally practiſed in New-England, is *leſs* pure and ſcriptural than that of the church of England, in a comparative view; (which, I am fully perſuaded, never has nor can be done) but that it is ſo *wholly* corrupt and unſcriptural, that we cannot be ſaid to enjoy "the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments," in a chriſtian and proteſtant ſenſe: So that the people here would, without the *Society*'s care, be in very imminent, peculiar danger of falling into atheiſm or infidelity, or being perverted to popery. Unleſs this is a true repreſentation of our religious or rather irreligious ſtate, all that has been hitherto ſaid to juſtify their conduct, muſt paſs for nothing. Some of my antagoniſts, I think all, have given broad hints that they conſider us in this diſadvantageous point of light. If this be their real meaning, let them ſpeak out boldly; and aſſign their reaſons. I do not believe they will preſume to do ſo, or reſt the cauſe here. If they do, I promiſe, that if God ſpares my life and health, they ſhall have either my anſwer or my *confeſſion*; and if the *latter*, I will alſo immediately become a proſelyte to the church of England, and endeavour, by my future zeal in her behalf, according to my mean abilities, to make ſome amends for whatever I have ſaid in times paſt, either againſt her, or againſt the conduct of the venerable *Society*. For I was never a *temporizer* in religious matters; but have always freely ſpoken, profeſſed, preached, publiſhed, what I thought agreeable to the word and will of God, whatever miſapprehenſions I may have been under in any reſpect.

I paſs over what the *Vindicator* ſays about the *Society*'s never having neglected the Southern colonies, or the Indians in any degree, as his *Ipſe-dixits*;—not only without any proof, but contrary to direct proofs produced in the *Obſervations*; and which therefore merit no particular reply. His general charges as to my abuſing the people of the church of England, and hav-

ing no charity for them; his intimations about hereſy; and his ſuggeſting that I am againſt toleration; all theſe things I paſs over alſo, as mere groundleſs calumnies, fit only to be deſpiſed. As I repeatedly ſaid in the *Obſervations*, I now again declare, that I eſteem and highly honor many epiſcopalians;—all of them who are perſons of virtue, moderation and candor; and am deſirous to live in friendſhip and good neighbourhood with them, notwithſtanding differences in opinion, if they will *condeſcend* to let me.

But there is ſomething in this ſelf-ſufficient, rude Cenſor's laſt paragraph, which muſt not eſcape without a brief animadverſion. He ſays, he cannot but imagine, that the "candid and ſerious, even among "the diſſenters themſelves, muſt be ſenſible that Dr. "Mayhew has moſt *unjuſtly* charged the *Society*, and "that his own friends can ſcarcely be able to with hold "a *bluſh* for him, at his indecent as well as injurious "treatment of that venerable body—and alſo at his "*mean* and *unworthy* perſonal *invectives* againſt the "*modeſt* and *very deſerving* gentleman, who has been "the innocent occaſion of provoking his *riotous pen.*"

1. I may preſume to know the opinion of thoſe whom he calls *diſſenters*, better than this unpoliſhed dogmatizer, whether a member of the *Society* or not. Nor have I the leaſt reaſon to think, that there is a ſingle man of them, who has read the *Obſervations*, but what thinks I fully and clearly proved what I undertook to ſhew, (if not *more*) and therefore did the *Society* no injuſtice.

2. I can upon good grounds aſſure him, that this is alſo the opinion of ſome "candid and ſerious" perſons even of the church of England: Who are, perhaps, as much diſpoſed to "bluſh" for the *Society*, as any of my friends are to bluſh for me, with relation to this matter.

3. I am ſincerely ſorry that, by ſpeaking of what he calls "mean and unworthy perſonal invectives againſt "the *modeſt* and *very deſerving gentleman*, who has been "the innocent occaſion of provoking my riotous "pen;" he ſhould at once give me reaſon to complain of his own foul language, and revive the remembrance

brance of that gentleman's inconcinnate performance; which, for the credit of the author and the cauſe, he ought to have wiſhed might remain in oblivion. His pamphlet was an inſult upon the memory of our fathers; and upon the miniſters, religion and churches of New-England. Neither his *modeſty*, nor his great *merits*, either as a ſcholar, gentleman or fair reaſoner, appeared in that performance: His uncommon ſelf-ſufficiency, his unfairneſs in mangling the charter, his contempt of other people, and even of *grammar*, were much more conſpicuous. In ſhort, he handled his argument in ſuch a manner, as naturally to excite both ridicule and reſentment; nor were all the advantages taken againſt him, that might juſtly have been taken. I am much deceived, (not to ſay *miſinformed)* if either his *equals* here, or his *ſuperiors* elſe-where, have been "able to with-hold a bluſh for him." And, by his long ſilence, there is room to entertain ſuch an opinion of his *modeſty*, as to ſuppoſe that he bluſhes for himſelf.—Theſe things are not ſaid by way of inſult upon that ill-adviſed gentleman, to whom I ſincerely wiſh well, but in my own neceſſary defence. So that both he and his friends have far leſs reaſon to blame me than the *Vindicator*; who, by his indiſcretion, his rude cenſures upon one hand, and his unſeaſonable compliments on the other, has put me upon thus calling back to remembrance what would otherwiſe have been fit only to be *forgotten*.—

The CONCLUSION.

The apprehenſions that were expreſſed towards the latter end of my *Obſervations*, that the Indians might probably give us diſturbance, were, alas! very ſoon after, and too ſadly proved to be juſt.—How many of our poſts and garriſons taken in a ſhort time!—What an extenſive frontier broken up!—What numbers of people, of ſoldiers, huſbandmen, women and children maſſacred, in a manner correſponding to the character of thoſe, whoſe "tender mercies are cruelty!"—Had all practicable methods been formerly taken,

to

to conciliate the friendſhip of the ſavage nations; to civilize and chriſtianize them, and to counteract the intrigues of the French: Particularly had the venerable *Society* uſed their beſt endeavours to this end, and left us in New-England to do as well as we could without their *charity*, it is highly probable that theſe great evils would not have come upon us. May it not be reaſonably hoped, that whenever a door ſhall be opened by a peace, for a friendly intercourſe with theſe nations, ſome methods will be vigorouſly purſued, in order to fix and retain them in the Britiſh intereſt? How much the ſending ſenſible and diſcreet miſſionaries among them, might probably contribute to that end, is very obvious.

It may be hoped that the *Society* and the right reverend Fathers of the church, will hereafter be both more zealous and more ſucceſsful in the proſecution of this important deſign, than they *appear* to have been in times paſt: And the rather, becauſe, as it is credibly reported, they of late employed all their weight and influence to cruſh in its embryo a *Society* then forming in America, for the ſame purpoſe;—partly thro' miſrepreſentations from epiſcopalians here, and partly becauſe they apprehended that *our* being countenanced in propagating *the goſpel*, would be *a prejudice to the church*. If after this, they ſhould themſelves neglect to chriſtianize the American heathen, ſome perſons who have leſs veneration for them than I have, may poſſibly think they a little too much reſemble thoſe ſpiritual guides of old, of whom it was ſaid by the chief Shepherd and Biſhop of ſouls, That they *ſhut up the kingdom of heaven againſt men; neither going in themſelves, nor ſuffering them that were entering, to go in**.

I am

* There is ground to think that ſome ill-minded epiſcopalians in America, repreſented to their correſpondents in London, that the Society propoſed here, was to be ſet up in *oppoſition* to the venerable Society at home, and to the church of England;—that it was a party-affair, and that no epiſcopalians could be admitted as members. If ſuch repreſentations were made, as there is good reaſon to believe, I preſume to ſay, they were abſolutely *falſe*.——I never heard of more than one epiſcopalian who deſired to be a member, and that gentleman was actually received accordingly.

I am well informed, without inquiry, that the Rev. Mr. CANER of King's Chapel in Boſton, uſhered into the world (at leaſt by correcting the preſs) the two abuſive pieces *(fratrum dulce par)* on which I have been remarking. Some might probably think it a *compliment* to him, to ſuppoſe him the real *Father* of either of them: I am little ſolicitous as to this. But if that gentleman thinks me in the wrong, it would, in my opinion, be much more to his honor to write in his own *name*, and to appear openly in the cauſe, than to be under-hand concerned in midwifing into the world ſuch illegitimate, inceſtuous children, begot by DECREPIT MALICE upon ZEAL for the church.—Suppoſe me to be really ſuch a man as I am repreſented in theſe pieces;—ſuppoſe me a perſon void of principle, an heretic, Socinian, Deiſt, Atheiſt—any thing—What is all this to the merits of the cauſe, whether the *Society* have, or have not, in ſome reſpects, miſapplied their money?—The moſt ſuperficial reader of theſe performances, eſpecially of the former of them, cannot but ſee, that it was the author's *principal* aim to blacken my character: And the *candor* of the methods uſed to this end, (numerous miſrepreſentations, and even groſs falſhoods) is equally conſpicuous †.

If any of the epiſcopalians ſhould ſtill chuſe to go on as they have begun, and long proceeded, to inſult and ſlander me in anonymous libels, inſtead of keeping to the point; I have no reaſon to be againſt this, except for their own ſake; being well perſuaded, that attacks of

† If ſome of the more rigid ſort of *Calviniſts* among ourſelves, are ſecretly pleaſed at ſeeing me vilified as an *heretic*, not only *while*, but *becauſe* I appear in their defence (according to my poor abilities) againſt the reproaches of epiſcopalians; I am not much ſurprized at this, conſidering what I have experienced in times paſt. But I have no diſpoſition, at leaſt not upon this occaſion, to *repeat grievances*. No treatment which I have, or may receive from perſons of a narrow, contracted way of thinking, ſhall diſcourage me from ſtanding up to the utmoſt of my power, in vindication of our religious liberties, and our congregational church order; which, in my humble opinion, is more ſcriptural, and liable to fewer inconveniencies, than any other now in the world; tho' there are others for which I have a great veneration.——

of this kind can neither hurt me in the end, nor ſerve their cauſe;—that it can neither be any credit to themſelves, to the *Society*, nor to the church of *England*.—But whatever opinion any of them may pleaſe to entertain of me, or whatever affronts and outrages they may offer to me, I am not of ſuch a vindictive temper, but that I ſincerely wiſh them well, and pray for their eternal felicity.—Nor can I make an end, without lamenting the unhappy condition of us mortals in this reſpect, That even ſome of thoſe, who perhaps intend equally well, and who would therefore have the moſt cordial eſteem and affection for one another, if they knew each others hearts; are yet, thro' difference of education, early and unperceived prejudices, and the imperfection of human knowledge in general, often led into ſuch different conceptions of things here on earth, that it ſeems hardly poſſible they ſhould meet together in the ſame *heaven*. Whatever any of thoſe may do, who differ from me in ſentiment; I will endeavour, by God's grace, to cultivate in myſelf ſuch a temper of mind;—particularly ſuch good-will and charity even towards my moſt inveterate enemies, that if I ſhould never have the happineſs to meet them *there*, (which God forbid) the fault will not be mine.

N. B. Whatever argument in this *Defence* is grounded on the ſuppoſed *civil* eſtabliſhment of religion here, or the King's eccleſiaſtical *ſupremacy*, is to be conſidered only as *argumentum ad hominem*.

2 JY 61

THE END.